

Also, petition of citizens of Keeseville, N. Y., favoring the emergency war prohibition bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, resolution of Woman's Christian Temperance Union, Winthrop, N. Y., indorsing the emergency war prohibition bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STEENERSON: Petition of ex-officers of the Civil War at the Veterans' Home, Napa County, Cal., favoring bills for the relief of Volunteer officers of the Civil War; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of Minneapolis (Minn.) Civic and Commerce Association, favoring passage of House bill 8172, relative to traffic on our inland waterways; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petitions of Clay County (Minn.) Farm Bureau and pastor and members of First Methodist Church of Fosston, Minn., favoring legislation prohibiting manufacturing and sale of alcoholic liquor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TAGUE: Petition of Massachusetts Dental Society on Senate bill 3386; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, petition of New York Publishers' Association (Inc.) on postal law; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of Massachusetts Audubon Society on Senate bill 1553; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of T. L. Lewis, Charleston, W. Va., on present coal situation; to the Committee on Agriculture.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

FRIDAY, February 1, 1918.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Lord God of Hosts, lest we forget, impress us with the truth that if ever a permanent world-wide peace obtains, it must be based upon the eternal principles of true religious convictions.

Thou has revealed Thyself as the universal Father, and therefore its corollary, the universal brotherhood of mankind.

Thou openest Thine hand and satisfiest the desire of every living thing.

The world is large enough, productive enough for all Thy children.

War is destructive. Religion is constructive. War is hate, revenge. Religion is love, peace, good will. War is contrary to reason and common sense. Religion has its source in the largest conception of life, reason, justice, mercy. War is hell. Religion is heaven.

Inspire us and all the world with these fundamentals, that a world-wide peace may come, a blessing to mankind. For Thine is the Kingdom, and the Power, and the Glory, forever. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to make one suggestion, as far as the Journal is concerned, before it is approved. The Journal states that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Moon] offered a privileged report on a certain bill. The gentleman from Tennessee, as I understand it, did not seek to offer the bill and report as privileged, but merely asked unanimous consent to present the bill and the report and have it submitted as if it were placed in the basket. He did not claim it was privileged.

The SPEAKER. No; what the gentleman asked was to have it put on the Union Calendar.

Mr. STAFFORD. He did not claim it was privileged, as the Journal states.

The SPEAKER. The Chair knows he did not state it was privileged, but he asked unanimous consent to put it on the Union Calendar.

Mr. STAFFORD. The Journal states that the gentleman from Tennessee presented a privileged report. He did not present a privileged report, and I ask that the Journal be corrected in that particular.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the Journal will be corrected in that respect.

There was no objection.

The Journal as corrected was approved.

### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Waldorf, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

S. 3006. An act to authorize and empower officers and enlisted men of the Navy and Marine Corps to serve under the Government of the Dominican Republic, and for other purposes;

S. 3126. An act to provide temporary promotion for retired officers of the Navy and Marine Corps performing active duty during the period of the present war;

S. 3427. An act for the relief of certain ex-paymasters' clerks; S. 3445. An act to authorize the payment of gun pointers and gun captains while temporarily absent from their regular stations, and for other purposes;

S. 3402. An act to fix the age limit for candidates for admission to the United States Naval Academy;

S. 3131. An act for the relief of Col. Littleton W. T. Waller, United States Marine Corps;

S. 3401. An act to authorize the President to reduce temporarily the course of instruction at the United States Naval Academy;

S. 3129. An act to provide for the disposition of the effects of deceased persons in the naval service;

S. 3130. An act to amend section 1570 of the Revised Statutes of the United States;

S. 3400. An act to regulate the pay of retired chief warrant officers on active duty;

S. 3404. An act to authorize the President to drop from the rolls any Navy or Marine Corps officer absent without leave for three months, or who has been convicted of any offense by the civil authorities, and prohibiting such officer's reappointment; and

S. 3406. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to determine where and when there are no public quarters available for officers of the Navy and Marine Corps.

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. RUBEEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record by inserting therein the message or address delivered by the President of the United States to the farmers of America.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks by printing the address of the President of the United States to the farmers of America. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

### CIVIL-SERVICE EXAMINATIONS.

Mr. GODWIN of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Senate joint resolution 117.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the joint resolution, which the Clerk will report by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

S. J. Res. 117 Joint resolution amending the act of July 2, 1909, governing the holding of civil-service examinations.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to have the resolution reported.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Resolved, etc.,* That the act of July 2, 1909 (36 Stats. L., 1), is hereby amended so as to permit the United States Civil Service Commission, during the period of the war, to hold examinations of applicants for positions in the Government service in the District of Columbia, and to permit applicants from the several States and Territories of the United States to take said examinations in the said District of Columbia. Said examinations shall be permitted in addition to those required to be held by said act of July 2, 1909 (36 Stats. L., 1).

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, for the present I shall have to object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wyoming objects.

### NOTIFICATION OF ILLNESS OF SOLDIERS.

Mr. REAVIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the House joint resolution 228, now on the Speaker's table, which I ask to have reported.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Nebraska asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the joint resolution which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows.

Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 228) to provide notification of illness of soldier.

*Resolved, etc.,* That the Secretary of War is hereby directed, immediately upon the admission of an enlisted man or officer of the United States Army to an Army hospital in continental America, to notify by telegraph the nearest relative of such enlisted man or officer of such admission, stating the disease from which such soldier suffers and the condition of his illness, as to whether slight, serious, or critical.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, has this resolution been reported by the committee?

Mr. REAVIS. It has not.

Mr. GARNER. Does not the gentleman think the Committee on Military Affairs ought to consider this resolution?

Mr. REAVIS. Will the gentleman reserve the right to object?

Mr. GARNER. Surely.

Mr. REAVIS. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, this resolution is not directed in criticism of any custom of the War Department, for the custom now obtaining in the War Department is the custom that has always obtained in that department with reference to the notification of the nearest relative of the soldier who is ill. I am speaking largely from personal experience, but from what I have learned in the short time since this resolution was introduced I am convinced that a great many parents in America are feeling exactly as I do about it. I have received a great many letters, especially from the eastern part of the continent, asking that this resolution be urged to an immediate passage. It is the prevailing custom of the War Department not to notify the parents of their son's illness. The first notification sent by the department is the notification of death.

There is no word sent to the home regarding the illness of the soldier. I know from personal experience that sometimes lads are thoughtless, and sometimes, probably, because they are very busy, 10 days or two weeks will go by without their writing home. And the parents, knowing the custom of the War Department is not to notify in case of illness, immediately infer that the lad is in the hospital, or, at any rate, is sick. If this Nation could be assured that notification would be given the nearest relative immediately upon the admission of a soldier to the hospital, it would relieve a great deal of anxiety, because in such event, if the boy does not write home, the assurance prevails in that home that no news is good news and that his failure to write is not occasioned by reason of illness.

Then there is another consideration that inspired me to introduce this resolution. There are many parents in this Nation who, if their sons are in the hospital, if they are ill, would like to be at their side. They would like the lad to know that somebody is there who is concerned and who understands, who would like to cheer him by the realization that his father or mother or both are at hand and watching over him. And there are many parents, gentlemen, if disaster should come to the boy, who would like to sit at his bedside and hold his hand as he gropes through the shadows of the approaching night in his journey to the dark river where the ferryman is waiting to bear him across.

This sending of your sons to war is serious business. The fortitude and the courage that has been shown by the homes of this Nation in offering their sons as a sacrifice upon the altar of the Nation's ideals is the strongest assurance we have that, in spite of difficulties and obstacles, we are going through. There is not a man in this Chamber who has not witnessed scenes that demonstrated courage of this kind, which, while sad and depressing, gave assurance that the Nation is behind this conflict even to the sacrifice supreme. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. REAVIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to continue for three minutes longer.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Nebraska asks unanimous consent to continue for three minutes longer. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. REAVIS. I remember a little incident of this kind which it was my sad privilege to see. I saw a mother standing by the doorway of her home, with a smile on her face, waving good-bye to her first born, as, brave and handsome in his new uniform, he started down the sad and solemn road that leads to war. I saw her smilingly wave good-bye to him until he turned the corner and was lost in the crowd. And then I saw the smile die away and her face twist, as she went wearily to the lonely solitude of his room and knelt by the pillow where her laddie was used to lie and sob her heart out in an agony of grief and fear as she prayed that he might come home again.

We have given to our brave women the assurance that this Nation will care for their sons. Let us give them the further assurance that we will give them immediate notification if things have not gone well with them. For that reason I have not waited for a report of the Military Committee, knowing how busy it was and how anxious the Nation is that this resolution shall be enacted. It is for that reason I have asked unanimous consent for its present consideration, that we may give the assurance to the homes of this Nation that we will advise them if anything goes wrong. [Applause.]

I hope the gentleman will not object.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Speaker, I want to suggest to the gentleman from Nebraska that he withhold his request until he can consult with the gentleman from California [Mr. KAHN] and the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. DENT]. They do not happen to be in the Chamber at this moment. The matter can be called up later in the day. I do not like to be put in the attitude of objecting to the present consideration of the resolution, but I will be compelled to do so if the gentleman insists. For that reason I ask him to withdraw it for the present, so that he may consult with these gentlemen.

Mr. REAVIS. The Military Committee is so busy with other matters that I very much fear that if we wait on the Military Committee this will be indefinitely postponed, and the time is here when the home ought to be informed that their lads are taken to the hospital ill.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman permit an interruption?

Mr. GARNER. Yes.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. This is confined to soldiers and to sailors who may be taken to hospitals in continental America.

Mr. GARNER. And the report of any kind of disease they may have can be telegraphed to their parents immediately.

Mr. REAVIS. And who should know it if not their parents?

Mr. GARNER. I think it should go over until the gentleman can see the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. DENT], or the gentleman from California [Mr. KAHN], anyway.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Speaker, I object.

#### CIVIL-SERVICE EXAMINATION.

Mr. GODWIN of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I understand that the gentleman from Michigan is willing to withdraw his objection to Senate joint resolution 117, and I ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution of which the Clerk will report the title.

The Clerk read as follows:

Joint resolution (S. J. Res. 117) amending the act of July 2, 1909, governing the holding of civil-service examinations.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, I want to reserve the right to object, and say that I think before this resolution should pass the chairman ought to agree to an amendment providing for those who have come to the District of Columbia within the last 12 months. And Members will call to mind the fact that when this matter was up in the Senate Senator OVERMAN took a position there and was instrumental in putting on the civil-service law a provision which tried to do away with all these employees going into the departments from the District of Columbia. Now, it means that if the bars are thrown down all these employees are likely again to come from the District of Columbia.

Mr. DOWELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to a question?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Mr. DOWELL. Does this resolution provide for the examination of those in the District the same as those in the States?

Mr. GODWIN of North Carolina. The law provides for the examination of those in the District as it does outside of the District, from the several States. The purpose of this bill is to permit, during the period of the present war, the examination of persons in the District of Columbia who are from other States; say, for example, citizens residing here temporarily who come from the State of Illinois. During the period of the war they would be permitted to take the examination in the District of Columbia without taking the time or going to the expense of going back to Illinois or to Tennessee or South Carolina or any other State. It does not affect the question of residence or the question of domicile. In other words, the bill provides against that. It says the law of apportionment shall not be abridged or affected. The only provision in this resolution is to permit temporary citizens from any State who happen to be here to take the examination here without forcing them to go back across the country to take it in their home States.

Mr. DOWELL. Then there is no change, as I understand, in the original law—

Mr. GODWIN of North Carolina. None whatever—

Mr. DOWELL. With reference to the selection of persons in the departments?

Mr. GODWIN of North Carolina. That is absolutely safeguarded.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MONDELL. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker—



Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, as to the amendment—

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois has not finished—

Mr. FOSTER. Which was placed in the civil-service law, the Senator who placed it there was very particular not only to say that the applicant must be a resident of the State but that he must be domiciled there, so that the filling of these departments all from the District of Columbia might be avoided. We all know that there are thousands here who may come from Michigan or Illinois or Pennsylvania or any other State, and it throws the doors absolutely wide open. It does not provide that those people shall be excluded after the war is over. Nobody knows how many of them may be retained.

Mr. DOWELL. As I understand it, this provision is not in the resolution?

Mr. FOSTER. No.

Mr. DOWELL. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa objects.

#### QUESTION OF PERSONAL PRIVILEGE.

Mr. BLANTON rose.

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Texas rise?

Mr. BLANTON. To give notice of bringing up a question of privilege.

The SPEAKER. If you are going to have the question of privilege up now, well and good.

Mr. BLANTON. I will state, Mr. Speaker, that I give notice now to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WILSON] that next Monday I shall rise to a question of personal privilege to answer an article that he has put into the Record this morning, yesterday's Record.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. WILSON] will take notice.

#### SOCIALIST STATE CONVENTION IN SOUTH DAKOTA.

Mr. LONDON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes. What about?

Mr. LONDON. I received this morning a letter from the secretary of the national executive committee of the Socialist Party, in which he protests against the breaking up of a Socialist State convention by the authorities in South Dakota.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes on the subject indicated. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LONDON. Mr. Speaker, I have not prepared myself for this short talk, and I speak more on impulse than in deliberation.

Only a few moments ago I read this letter from the secretary of the national executive committee of the Socialist Party. He tells me that he is in receipt of several letters from South Dakota, complaining that the authorities prohibited the holding of a Socialist convention at Mitchell, S. Dak., on January 22, 1918. He says:

Not only was the convention broken up, but a lawless mob seized Comrade William C. Rempfer—

Socialists refer to each other as "comrades"—

one of our most active comrades, and deported him from the city. The purpose of this convention was to nominate candidates for office and draft a State platform.

He writes further:

Something ought to be done about this, and I believe that Congress is a good place to unmask the capitalist anarchists that are parading under the mantle of "democracy."

I shall now read a copy of a letter from William C. Rempfer, upon which the complaint of the national secretary is based. The letter was addressed, the national secretary informs me, by Mr. Rempfer to the governor of the State of South Dakota and to Mayor J. F. Wells, of Mitchell, S. Dak.:

The convention of the Socialist Party of South Dakota, duly called for January 22, 23, and 24, met in Mitchell for the purpose of drafting a platform and nominating State candidates for the next general election, subject to referendum of the party membership.

It was an orderly political convention, conducting its business in a legal way. The sessions were public, and a representative of the city government was requested to be present at all sessions.

Imagine the surprise of the delegates when on the morning of the 23d orders were given by the police of Mitchell to disperse the convention, and the convention was dispersed by the authorities.

We were informed that Mayor Wells, who was attending a meeting of the State council of defense at Sioux Falls, had telephoned the police of Mitchell to disperse the meeting of the delegates then in session and to forbid further sessions of the convention.

If similar action is taken when the Democratic Party and the Non-partisan League attempt to hold their conventions, Gov. Norbeck will be unanimously reelected governor of South Dakota in November, for the obvious reason that it will be impossible to nominate candidates against him.

I was duly elected delegate to the Socialist convention. A short time after our convention was adjourned sine die by the city authorities of Mitchell, news reached me that the police had ordered me out of town. About half hour later, while I was walking on the main street of the city, an automobile dashed up to the curb near me, five men sprang out, and laying hands on me from all sides, they forced me into the car. I demanded to know by what authority or under what orders I was thus treated, but in vain. Carefully guarded on all sides and ordered to keep my mouth shut, I was driven into the country a distance of 5 miles, when the car came to a stop. The ringleader opened the door and ordered me out, saying, "Ethan is 8 miles south. Don't you attempt to telephone from any farm house along the line. There are men there to stop you. And don't you ever come back to Mitchell. That's permanent." Thereupon these guardians of democracy got into the car and returned to Mitchell.

Do you countenance these two examples of mob-law methods, or do you deem it advisable to institute a thorough investigation and prosecution of the guilty offenders, even though they be public officials?

For the present I will only say that now, when the whole world is watching the work of the German social democracy, when the hope of every mother in America is that the spirit of rebellion and love of democracy and love of general peace among the German socialists will save the American boys from the trenches, when the hope of the whole world is that the revolutionary movement will wind up the war abroad and force a universal peace and compel tyrant and oppressor, plutocrat and financier, imperialist and traitor against the welfare of the people to restore the world to a normal state, it is a dastardly act, it is the act of scoundrels, to be breaking up Socialist conventions. It can do no good to America. It can do no good to the cause in which this country is engaged. It will not increase the respect for the democracy of the United States, and this Congress should take some action. Somebody should take action to condemn methods of this sort.

Mr. AUSTIN. Will the gentleman tell us what this man was doing, or what kind of a speech he was making, to provoke the law officers to arrest him?

Mr. LONDON. I do not know what speech he was delivering, but I have read before you a communication, and I base my speech upon this communication; and I furthermore say—

Mr. AUSTIN. Suppose he was inciting revolution, or opposition to the Federal draft law, for instance; what would be the gentleman's position?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from New York yield to the gentleman from Tennessee?

Mr. LONDON. I do not care to yield, but the gentleman has asked a question, and I say if this man advocated opposition to the draft, there is a law to deal with that subject, and the individual who advocated opposition to the draft should have been dealt with as an individual; but the breaking up of a convention of a political party is a denial of every principle of democracy.

Mr. AUSTIN. That depends on what the convention was doing.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. LONDON. I decline to yield further, and I do not care to have these interruptions. One can readily see the danger of little groups of men assuming the function of guardians of liberty. What a fine state of affairs we will have if groups of ignorant merchants with their clerks will assume to be censors of speeches and of the press and break up political conventions. If the gentleman thinks that is a good method, that that is a safe thing for democracy, he has a peculiar notion of democracy. I hope Congress will take some action to make a repetition of these offenses impossible. The importance and influence of the United States in the present world contest, the participation of the United States in this world struggle can only be effective to the extent to which people respect America as a liberty-loving country. It is not the armies of America that will count, it is the fact that this Republic is to be the carrier of ideals of democracy; that will count.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LONDON. Pardon me one moment. Every denial by the constituted authorities of the fundamental principles of law injures the United States in the eyes of the world, and by injuring the United States it postpones the day when peace will be restored.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from New York yield to the gentleman from Minnesota?

Mr. LONDON. No—well, I will yield.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. The gentleman had better yield, or hereafter when he asks unanimous consent to address the House he will not get it.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Minnesota is out of order.

Mr. LONDON. I yield to the gentleman in spite of his threat.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. All right.

The SPEAKER. The remark of the gentleman from Minnesota is out of order. Now, any question he wants to ask the gentleman from New York—

Mr. LONDON. I yield to the gentleman—

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. By permission of the Chair—

Mr. LONDON. I yield for a relevant question, of course.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Does the gentleman recognize any difference between disloyalty and treason and democracy?

Mr. LONDON. Oh, why should the gentleman not ask me whether I recognize any difference between a Member of Congress from Minnesota and a mule from Missouri?

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. I do not imagine that the gentleman recognizes that there is any difference.

Mr. LONDON. They are two different propositions. The gentleman does not come from Missouri, anyway, and I would not care to designate him as the thing to which I referred. There is no comparison between democracy and the things he mentions.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. If the gentleman can tell the difference, his intelligence is greater than I have given him credit for heretofore.

Mr. LONDON. There is no comparison between these things, and if parliamentary practice would permit it I would call the gentleman's question by its proper name; but I prefer to be polite all the time. [Laughter.]

#### AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATIONS.

On motion of Mr. LEVER, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 9054) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, with Mr. CRISP in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. When the committee rose last evening the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER] had proposed an amendment, and on that amendment the committee had agreed that there should be 50 minutes of debate, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. McLAUGHLIN] to control half that time and the gentleman from South Carolina to control half. For the information of the committee the Chair will now direct the Clerk to read the amendment proposed by the gentleman from South Carolina.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 78, in lieu of the paragraph stricken out at the top of the page, insert the following:

"For enabling the Secretary of Agriculture to investigate and certify to shippers the condition as to soundness of fruit, vegetables, and other food products, when received at such important central markets as the Secretary of Agriculture may from time to time designate and under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe: *Provided*, That certificates issued by authorized agents of the department shall be received in all courts as prima facie evidence of the truth of the statements therein contained."

Mr. LEVER. I ask the gentleman from Michigan, [Mr. McLAUGHLIN] to use some of his time.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. ROBBINS].

Mr. ROBBINS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct my opposition to this amendment, especially to the clause which provides that the certificates issued by the agents of the Department of Agriculture shall be received as prima facie evidence in the courts. This is an attempt to change entirely the rules of evidence, and I appeal now to the lawyers of this body whether we ought to take a drastic step of that kind. The amendment has been changed by the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture by leaving out the provision for "the payment of the fees" for services of this kind by the party whose goods are examined.

Mr. LEVER. Will the gentleman permit me just for a moment?

Mr. ROBBINS. I have only five minutes.

Mr. LEVER. That was in the original proposition—

Mr. ROBBINS. I know. The gentleman has omitted it from the amendment.

Mr. LEVER. It was not done by me, but by the gentlemen on the other side.

Mr. ROBBINS. The gentleman wants to put in this amendment on the ground that it is incorporated in the general food-control bill. That does not make it a legal proposition by any means. What we propose to do here is to make the certificate of an authorized agent of the Department of Agriculture prima facie evidence in the courts.

It is unfair to establish a different method of proof in the case of loss or damage to a consignment of vegetable or fruit

from that which applies in case of a shipment of coal, lumber, or merchandise. In case of perishable goods the loss may be occasioned by the negligence of the carrier "in transit," or it may be it is the result of the refusal of the consignee to promptly accept and properly care for the shipment, or the damage or loss may arise from many other causes. Now, I submit, Mr. Chairman, a mere certificate, ex parte in character and not sworn to, should not be accepted as sufficient proof of such loss.

The only proper method of establishing the facts that constitute such loss or damage would be by a deposition regularly taken upon notice and the submission of cross-interrogatories or by taking the evidence in court, where an opportunity is given to meet the witnesses and cross-examine them. This amendment is for the benefit of the farmer. The method proposed does not contain these safeguards and will work great hardship on our farmers.

The procedure here provided is contrary to the practice of all the courts in all the various Commonwealths that I know anything about. It provides that a certificate, not given under oath, but a loose certificate by an agent of the Department of Agriculture, shall be taken in the courts and accepted on the same basis as a deposition, without opportunity to cross-examine, and without an opportunity to ascertain what the facts are, and ascertain them according to the usual practice in courts of law. Here is a prima facie case made out by the mere ex parte certificate not under oath, given by any agent of the Department of Agriculture, a very unusual and unsatisfactory method of procedure.

Let us see how it will work out. If, as the gentleman said last night, a carload of asparagus or lettuce is shipped from South Carolina to the market in the city of Pittsburgh, if, when it arrives, it is in a damaged condition and the consignee refuses to accept it, all he has to do is to go to one of the agents of the Department of Agriculture and get a prima facie certificate that it is damaged, and he is not bound to accept it. Now, the consignor lives at a distance in the South, and is a vegetable grower, because that is the kind of people that are supposed to get protection under this bill, and when he undertakes to collect for his shipment he will be confronted by this ex parte certificate of the agent of the department which will estop him when he seeks to recover. It may be that he will have to go into the district court of the United States, being a citizen of another State.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBBINS. I will.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. I think none of us have seen the amendment or read it. Will the gentleman state what the certificate will contain, what statement of facts?

Mr. ROBBINS. There is nothing to regulate it except that it is expected that the Department of Agriculture, through the Secretary, will prescribe rules and regulations. I do not know what those will be, but I assume that they will be reasonable and just; but that is not the point; we are changing the proceedings in courts and the established rules of evidence.

I think the constitution of the gentleman's State, and I appeal to the chairman of the Agricultural Committee, for I assume he is a lawyer, must contain some provision like we have in the State constitution of Pennsylvania, wherein it is provided that "the legislature shall not pass any law regulating the practice in courts, or change the rules of evidence in any judicial proceeding."

This amendment, therefore, is wrong, wrong in principal, and it is flying in the teeth of all practice in my Commonwealth; and of course the United States courts that would try these cases in the several States are guided by the rules of evidence that apply in the State where the court is located. If we are to accept these certificates, we will establish by statute the principle that the declaration of an agent, unverified, is to be taken as prima facie evidence against the claim made by a citizen of a distant State who may be the consignor of the vegetable product. That is against the practice of our courts and the law as now administered and therefore I think the proviso ought to be stricken from the bill altogether as vicious and of no good value to legislation enacted by this Congress.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. BYRNES].

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, under the practice existing for marketing foods and vegetables the truck growers have been forced to be the greatest gamblers in the country. They invest their money in high-grade fertilizers, overhead irrigation and other expensive methods, and produce vegetables and fruit. Then, in response to attractive circulars they send them to commission merchants in the great markets of the Nation. They have turned their products over to the



railroads to be transported to the commission merchant and sold by him and the returns made. They have waited to see what the car would bring, and in too many instances it has brought nothing but a demand for a check to pay the freight, because the commission merchant has claimed that the produce when it arrived was in bad condition. The farmer has had no earthly chance to ascertain whether or not the statement was true. He could not maintain a representative in the markets of the Nation.

Now, we propose by this service, for which the appropriation of \$113,000 is proposed, to have a representative of the Bureau of Markets stationed in these markets to certify to the condition of the produce whenever the grower asks that an inspection be made to ascertain whether or not the vegetables or fruit are really in bad condition. The mere presence of an inspector of the bureau, whose services are at the disposal of the farmer, will cause the commission man to hesitate to misrepresent the condition of the produce upon arrival. The hearings will show that from the State of Washington the Yakima Truck Growers' Association called on the Bureau of Markets to make such an inspection, and it saved the truck growers money. In the hearings Mr. Brand, the chief of the bureau, also gave an instance of a peach growers' association in Arkansas shipping several cars of peaches to Chicago. The Bureau of Markets, acting on the request of the truck growers' association, made an investigation and found that the commission merchants had robbed the truck and fruit growers of Arkansas, and as a result the growers were able to recover the money due them.

The evil exists and the remedy can be applied by the Bureau of Markets. The question is, shall we refuse to apply it because, as was suggested yesterday, it is paternalism. Why, 50 per cent of the appropriations provided for in the Agriculture bill is paternalistic. Unless some remedy is applied, the truck growers can not continue business. No agency but a Government agency can serve to relieve the situation. Now, the President calls on the farmers to increase their acreage. Under the methods I have described would one of you continue to plant vegetables? You would not, unless you are a natural gambler. I have known many men who were compelled to discontinue the planting of fruits and vegetables simply because there was no way of getting a square deal from the commission men. The gentleman from Pennsylvania says it would be a violation of the rules of evidence to provide that the certificate of the inspector shall be accepted as prima facie evidence of condition. You have similar provisions, providing for a similar certificate by the Interstate Commerce Commission, that it shall be received as prima facie evidence in the courts of any State as to the rates. You can look at the warehouse act and find the same thing. If he has fear that the truck grower will be injured by the certificate, the truck growers will rise and waive their rights under it, because they know it offers them the only chance to secure a square deal from the commission men. The railroads will not object. I have stood in the courthouse time after time when a grower has brought an action against a railroad company based upon a telegram from a commission merchant in some market saying his cantaloupes, for instance, arrived in bad condition. The railroad has brought in employees from the Potomac Yards, and all of the terminal yards, to show that the car was properly iced and that the fruit arrived there in good condition. In the majority of cases, I am satisfied, the railroads were not liable, and the cantaloupes did not arrive at their destination in bad condition. The truth was that the commission merchant was robbing the farmer. And they have defrauded the Colorado farmer, the grower in Washington, California, and throughout the West just as they have the truck growers of the South. Now, if we deny the use of a governmental agency here, we will discourage production at a time when it is needed and hereafter vegetables will be higher in the markets of the East at a time when we all know we ought to do what we can to make them lower. By increasing the production of perishable foodstuffs for consumption in this country we will make it possible to ship more nonperishable foodstuffs to our soldiers and our allies in Europe. [Applause.]

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD].

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, we are launching on a policy, if we adopt this amendment, the final outcome of which no one can predict. Adopt this amendment as it stands here to-day, which is limited only to inspection of truck gardening, fruits, and foodstuffs in central markets, and you will have a demand growing and growing which will finally require you to have inspection not only in the central markets but in every market of the country, not only limited to this character of produce but to live stock and to all character of shipments. As far as I know the dealings between commission merchants and

truck gardeners tributary to my home city has not been such as to bring any criticism upon those commission merchants that they were not upright. Their dealings have been based on good faith, and when the farmer has shipped berries or other garden truck to the market in Milwaukee there has been no complaint that he has not received his full rights and compensation for it. But here we have the idea that every character of shipment, whether the dealings between the commission merchant and the producer are satisfactory or not, must be examined by these inspectors. This will create a horde of inspectors where there is no necessity. I grant for the sake of argument that there may be instances cited where the commission merchant has taken advantage of the producer and has not dealt fairly, but in the course of business that condition rights itself. The producer is not going to deal with a disreputable commission merchant, but by this provision, instead of merely inspecting the goods of those where they may not have had proper consideration before, you are going to oblige every shipment sent to the central markets to be examined, and that report accepted with full faith in the courts, regardless of what the commission merchant may say as to the character of the shipment. If we are going to launch on this policy of paternalism, there is no end to which it may go. I felt compelled to make the point of order yesterday against this new activity of the National Government in trying to prevent it going into a field where there is no necessity for it.

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAFFORD. Yes.

Mr. FORDNEY. I know of an instance where a Michigan fruit grower made a shipment of peaches to Chicago. Word came back from the commission dealer that he did not receive enough for the fruit to pay the freight, and he sent a bill for \$2.78, and asked the shipper to remit that amount to him. The shipper replied, "I have no more money, but can send you another carload of peaches." What are you going to do in such a case as that? [Laughter.]

Mr. STAFFORD. Oh, the gentleman can cite isolated cases, but the gentleman knows also there are hundreds of cases where there has not been any unfair dealing between the fruit grower and the commission merchant, and yet every consignment imaginable will have to be inspected and the returns of all the reputable dealings will be passed on, as well as those few instances of disreputable dealings. I answer the gentleman by saying that after that producer has ascertained that the commission merchant is not dealing fairly with him, is he going to continue to do business with him? Are you going to have Government inspectors determine who is the proper person for the gardener to deal with in the sale of produce? Perhaps the gentleman from Michigan is in favor of this paternalistic policy, and I assume he is. I assume he wants all shipments of every kind to be inspected on their arrival to determine whether the dealing between the producer and the commission merchant should continue, or allow the relations in the natural course of business to continue as they have done in the past.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina. Is not the gentleman mistaken in thinking that every shipment will have to be inspected? This is only where the shipper calls upon the Bureau of Markets to perform this service.

Mr. STAFFORD. But there is no such limitation at all in the provision. It has been testified here that the head of this bureau wants to enlarge his activities. If the producer is satisfied with existing arrangements with the commission merchant, why should not that condition be continued rather than force on the Government the inspection of every character of shipment of produce sent to these central distributing points?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. FAIRFIELD].

Mr. FAIRFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I am not opposed to the principle involved in this legislation. I am not sure but that the time will come when shipments will have to be safeguarded more thoroughly to the farmer. What I object to is that in a single paragraph here in an appropriation bill legislation of such far-reaching consequence should be immediately passed upon without proper safeguarding that legislation. Who is interested in this legislation? You would think that only the shipper is involved, but not only the shipper but the common carrier, the commission merchant, and the public are all involved in legislation of this kind. To give an illustration with reference to the need of such legislation, two or three years ago a lawyer friend of mine said to me, "I had a peculiar case the other day. A commission house of this city had refused a carload of watermelons—denied payment. We brought suit for the man

who had shipped the melons. It was found out that when the melons arrived there was an unusual number of melons on the market and that the commission merchant permitted them to remain in the car for 48 hours, when the stock was practically worthless." This called my attention sharply to the problem. I learned also that men sometimes, in shipping onions and in shipping potatoes, were absolutely helpless in the hands of a commission merchant. On the other hand, however, to begin a thing like this it might be well for us to inquire as to what should be the characteristics of the inspector. He should be alert, active, and, above all else, he should be honest, for the commission men of this country are not, as a rule, dishonest. I have but little respect for that sort of a proposition which arraigns a great body of business men as being dishonest, yet it is true that again and again the farmer suffers. In my judgment this legislation ought to compel that the inspector be bonded. It ought to be safeguarded at least to that extent, and that he should be called into court the same as any other witness and examined carefully, so that all sides may have opportunity for redress if it is necessary. For that reason, gentlemen, not because I am opposed to the principle of the legislation, I think the legislation is dangerous thus quickly to be passed without studying it more thoroughly than we are capable of studying it at this time.

Mr. ROBBINS. Will the gentleman permit a question?

Mr. FAIRFIELD. I will.

Mr. ROBBINS. Does not the gentleman think any inspector who has such responsibilities as are placed on him by this bill should be subject to cross-examination?

Mr. FAIRFIELD. Absolutely.

Mr. ROBBINS. For the protection of the farmer as well as the consignee?

Mr. FAIRFIELD. Absolutely.

Mr. LEE of Georgia. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY].

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that I have somewhere read or heard something about it being necessary to conserve food for the purpose of winning the war. One of the cardinal principles in a rational system of conservation is that we shall utilize as much as possible the perishable foods so that the nonperishable foods may be sent to our Army.

Now, it seems to me that gentlemen take a very peculiar position when they are willing to appropriate thousands, yea, millions, of dollars, to make agricultural investigations and publish agricultural reports and bulletins, and in theorizing, and in fictional farming, and yet when it comes to permitting the Department of Agriculture to really do something practical and tangible they throw their hands up in holy horror and say it is no function of the Government.

Already you have heard a great deal here about the abuses that have crept into the system of marketing farm produce. Now, I am not speaking alone for the producer, but also for the consumer, because whenever you destroy a market for the producer you are destroying a market for the consumer. Whenever you prevent the producer from getting his perishable products to the man that is waiting to eat them, you are not only injuring the producer but you are injuring the man who is hungry. And so, gentlemen, it seems to me that this provision of the bill which authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to permit the inspection of farm products by his inspectors and the making of a certificate to that effect is a very wholesome regulation.

Now, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] seemed to be very much afraid that this provision would require the inspection of all shipments. This provision is already in the food-control bill, and my information is that the Secretary of Agriculture only inspects shipments when called upon to do so. On the other hand, the gentleman from Wisconsin, I suppose, would only have an inspection made in cases where lawsuits ensue, and he would wait until all the produce and fruit had rotted and been thrown in the river or condemned by the State authorities, and then he would have the Secretary of Agriculture make a professional inspection, or post-mortem examination. [Laughter.]

Now, gentlemen, these abuses have happened in the past, and they will happen in the future unless some regulation of this kind is made.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, may I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Yes, sir.

Mr. MASON. Is it not a fact also that these proposed inspectors will be a protection to the honest commission merchant, so far as damaged goods that have been shipped to him are concerned? He can call for an inspection. That certificate is prima facie evidence, which can not be overcome, and it is a

protection not only to the producer or consumer but to every commission merchant who is honestly dealing with his customers.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. I am very glad indeed to have the gentleman from Illinois call that matter to my attention, and I heartily agree with that proposition, because the honest commission merchant will then have a way of convincing the shipper that he has in fact given him a square deal.

Mr. LITTLE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Yes.

Mr. LITTLE. While we will admit, for purpose of argument, anyway, that the commission merchant is just as honest as everybody else, is it not a fact that the peculiar character of this commission business, which subjects the commission man to the rise and fall of the market that he can not regulate really subjects him to more temptation than anybody else?

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. I have not been a commission merchant, and I am not sure as to how much temptation—

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Will it tempt the commission merchant any more than it will tempt the farmer to put a few bad apples in the bottom of the basket?

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Since the gentleman from Pennsylvania is looking at it from one direction and the gentleman from Kansas from another direction, I am going to leave it to their own settlement. But when you destroy a market for the one, you destroy it for the other.

At the last session of Congress there were loosed in this Chamber many cubic feet of oratory about the venality, the crookedness, and the general all-around cussedness of the middle man; he was castigated and villified; no term of execration was spared, and there was a loud cry for his crucifixion; Members demanded his utter destruction. Now, the functions of the middle man are necessary to healthy and normal commerce. There must be some agency to buy products and resell and distribute them to the ultimate consumer, especially where the consuming centers are far removed from the producing centers. If the Government should destroy the middle man and should fail to furnish a substitute, food would rot in producing centers, and people would starve in consuming centers. Is it not much better and wiser to permit the middle man, the broker, the commission merchant, and jobber to continue to perform the useful functions involved in the purchase, sale, and distribution of products and yet at the same time require him to act with fairness and good conscience toward sellers and buyers alike? Great quantities of perishable foods are wasted each year because of poor market conditions and transportation difficulties. Farmers and truck growers often permit products to waste rather than incur transportation charges and run the risk of receiving advices from a broker hundreds of miles away that their produce arrived in a condition so damaged as to be unmarketable. The amendment will measurably remedy that situation, and I hope that it may be adopted.

When we make it easier for the producer of foods to get a "square deal" it will also be easier for the consumer to get a "square meal." [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. JUUL].

Mr. JUUL. Mr. Chairman, this clause of the Agricultural bill seeks to appropriate \$113,000 to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to investigate and certify to shippers and other interested parties the quality and condition of fruits, vegetables, and other food products when received at such important markets as the Secretary of Agriculture from time to time designates.

I think the gentlemen on this floor fail to take cognizance of the fact that the bill just speaks upon the subject of receiving. You want inspection of fruits, vegetables, when it is received. The difficulty is not happening when the fruit is received, for instance, in Chicago, it is happening about the time it is sold, and I do not imagine that many of you gentlemen have seen the yards in the big railway terminals in Chicago when fruit arrives during the summer time.

Cars arrive by the hundreds, and this difficulty of which you have spoken here to-day, shipping fruits to the great markets and instead of getting the proper checks for the produce receiving bills from the commission merchants for transportation. Many times the cause of this difficulty is not dishonesty but the fact that the fruit comes into Chicago on Saturday or on days before legal holidays, the yards are crowded with the fruit, and there is no opportunity in the time between the arrival of the fruit and the holiday to get it out of the yards and profitably marketed, so the fruit or vegetables, as the case may be, is turned over to a number of peddlers and the fruit offered to them at any price that can be gotten, and I have often seen numerous



peddlers' wagons with the peddlers crying a dozen peaches for a nickel.

You can imagine what he pays for them when he sells them at that price. You can see that condition in Chicago, and I suppose in all large centers of this country, time after time.

And I think, Mr. Chairman, that in this bill, in line 4, the gentleman having the bill in charge ought to insert in addition to the matter of inspection a proviso to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to investigate and certify to shippers and other interested parties the quality and condition of fruit, vegetables, and other food products when received and at the time of sale.

The question is not only of the condition when the fruit is received in the yards. It is a question of the condition of the fruit when it is marketed, and you can not send unlimited numbers of cars of fruit into South Water Street, the great produce street in Chicago, having these cars arrive on Saturday afternoons, and always be sure to sell it at once at prices which such fruit ought to bring.

On the receipt of vast quantities of fruit on a Saturday or the day before any day not a market day you can do one of two things, namely, let the stuff become a total loss or get for it what you can and report the result to the shipper.

I am not here to defend dishonest commission men. I hope they will put them all in jail.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman permit an interruption?

Mr. JUUL. Yes.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. As to the reason that you mentioned, of this deterioration of this perishable stuff, does not the commission merchant take that into account in the prices he charges his customers? I think they do that in this city at least.

Mr. JUUL. I will say that he does take it into consideration.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Then should the farmer be obliged to bear any portion of it, if he sends the goods and they reach the commission merchant in good shape?

Mr. JUUL. That is the question. Do they reach the commission merchant in good shape? They reach the tracks in good shape, but the freight piles up by hundreds and hundreds of cars and the next day is a holiday. If the next day should be a market day, it could be sold; but if the commission merchant does not clear it up the stuff rots on the tracks.

I firmly believe in inspection both as a measure of protection for the farmer and for the protection of the reputation of the honest commission merchant, who is often confronted with enormous shipments of perishable produce.

When said shipments arrive in the great cities faster than disposition can be made of them, the middleman's only choice is to dispose of them for anything they will bring.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. JUUL. Mr. Chairman, I ask leave to insert the few words that I failed to utter.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wyoming is recognized for three minutes.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I am not enamored of paternalism, and I think we should be very careful about endeavoring to change the rules of evidence in the courts. I am much impressed by what the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. McLAUGHLIN] and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. ROBBINS] have said relative to these matters. Yet, after all is said and done, we are indulging in paternalism to a very large extent in many lines, and if we can, along this line, indulge in a little paternalism that ought to be and could be and will be, if honestly administered, a benefit to the producer and the consumer alike, I think we may very properly do it.

It is something of an experiment. It is an experiment that may involve possibly scandal. The men employed by the Federal Government may not always be honest and conscientious and upright and fair in their judgment. But we must assume that they will be, and there is a service here that, if properly and wisely rendered, will be very valuable. We need to smooth the way between the grower and the producer and the consumer; to cut down, as far as we can, the gap of prices between the two and make the way easy to a distribution that will give the producer a fair price and honest treatment, and the consumer his product at the lowest price possible.

I am inclined to think this experiment is a wise one. We ought at least to try it out and see how it works. I am sure it will do good.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wyoming has expired.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I ask the gentleman from Michigan to yield some time.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for three minutes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I do not object to the inspection of these perishable fruits on their receipt at any market place, nor would I object to their inspection at the point of shipment. It seems to me it would be just as important to inspect them when shipped as it would be to inspect them on their receipt, because many things happen between the time they are put on their journey and the time they arrive, and much could be said in behalf of the commission merchant in that regard.

I do not believe commission merchants are wholly dishonest. There may be a few dishonest ones amongst them, just as there may be a few men in the farming fraternity who would be inclined to take advantage of an opportunity to put a few small potatoes in the bottom of a barrel or a few bad apples in the bottom of a basket. But that should not reflect on the entire farming community. We must assume that both parties are honest, and we should realize that one depends upon the other. The commission man is essential to the farmer, because the farmer of Nebraska, for instance, can not get directly to the door of the consumer in New York or Washington. He must depend upon an intermediary to get him to the market. I do not like the wholesale denunciation of the commission man; he is the necessary middleman between the producer and the consumer. The producer and the consumer can not get together with respect to these perishable commodities without the intervention of the commission merchant; he is justified in the position he occupies.

What I do object to here is the proviso in this amendment that the certificates issued by the Government inspector shall be received in all courts as prima facie evidence of the truth of the statements therein contained, without giving the right to either party to the contrary to call him to court. I am not enough of a lawyer to discuss the rules of evidence, but it seems to me if an inspector is capable of making a certificate, he is capable of backing it up in court. I would not care to rely on the certificate of an inspector who operated wholly in a farming district, any more than I would care to rely upon the certificate of an inspector who operated wholly among the commission merchants. He may be influenced by one or the other, and if there was a controversy between the parties who unfortunately had to go to court, one or the other of them ought to have the right to summon that inspector into court to prove the accuracy of his certificate.

Mr. REAVIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Yes.

Mr. REAVIS. What is there in this to prevent the inspector being called as a witness?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Nothing, except that the certificate of the inspector shall be accepted as prima facie evidence.

Mr. REAVIS. Only prima facie, not conclusive, evidence.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I say I am not sufficiently versed in law to discuss the rules of evidence, but several gentlemen who are lawyers have done so. I do not think a certificate issued by an inspector, who is essentially human, and who is subject to influence by farmers on the one hand or by commission merchants on the other, should be accepted in court as evidence. A party to a suit ought to have the right to summon the inspector for cross-examination.

Mr. REAVIS. There is nothing in this to prevent his summoning the inspector, and his certificate must be prima facie, not conclusive, evidence.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. If it means nothing, why is the proviso inserted?

Mr. REAVIS. Of course it means something.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. It is evident that the certificate is to be taken as evidence in the absence of the inspector.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. CANDLER].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, the present food-control law contains this item:

For gathering authoritative information in connection with the demand for and the production, supply, distribution, and utilization of food, and otherwise carrying out the purpose of section 2 of this act; extending and enlarging the market news service; and preventing

waste of food in storage, in transit, or held for sale; advise concerning the market movement or distribution of perishable products; for enabling the Secretary of Agriculture to investigate and certify to shippers the condition as to soundness of fruits, vegetables, and other food products, when received at such important central markets as the Secretary of Agriculture may from time to time designate and under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe: *Provided*, That certificates issued by the authorized agents of the department shall be received in all courts as the truth of the statements therein contained.

The amendment pending is in accordance with this provision in the food law and prescribes the amount of money that is to be appropriated.

Now, this provision pending before the House does not enact the law to make the certificates *prima facie* evidence. That is already in the law. It is in the food law; it is in the warehouse law; it is in the grain-grading law; it is in all the laws that have been enacted along this line on matters of this character. Therefore the argument in reference to enacting this into law necessarily fails to the ground because it is already the law. But if it is not the law it would be a good thing to put in here now. It simply shifts the burden of proof; that is all. It does not deny to the commission merchant the right to controvert it at all. It simply has this effect, that when you introduce that certificate that establishes a *prima facie* case. Then the other man, if he wants to controvert any statement in this certificate, can furnish the proof, if there is proof, to overcome that *prima facie* case made by the introduction of the certificate of the inspector. Gentlemen, this provision pending if enacted will not only protect the shipper but it will protect the transportation company; it will protect the honest commission merchant; and it will protect the public. There is not a single criticism that has been offered to this provision up to date by anybody; that is a sufficient answer to show why it ought not to become a law, because the sole purpose of it is to secure honesty in dealing between the shipper and the commission merchant who is dealing with the public. It is in the interest of fair dealing, in the interest of the protection of the man who is honest and wants to do the right thing, whether he be shipper, merchant, or consumer. The merchant who proposes to deal honestly and squarely with the man who is shipping his products to him will not object to this provision. The shipper will not object to it, because it furnishes him with the protection he ought to have. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] said it would create a horde of inspectors. There is no danger of that, because there will be no demand for inspection unless there is complaint and unless there is a request. Therefore, not every shipment will be inspected, but only shipments where the shipper knows or believes that his product when it left his hands was in good shape and when on reaching destination it is reported to be in bad condition, and when it is of sufficient importance for him to request the Department of Agriculture to have it inspected and see whether it is in good condition, or whether it is in bad condition. Then, when that request is made, the inspector makes that inspection and gives the certificate provided for in this provision, certifying to the good condition or the bad condition of the product as he finds the truth to be. By that the shipper secures protection, and the commission merchant at the other end of the line is protected, because if he has reported the product in bad condition correctly, if the shipment is really in bad condition the inspector goes there and the commission merchant demonstrates that fact to him, and he certifies that it is in bad condition. That satisfies the shipper, it protects the commission merchant, and it protects the public as well. Hence, I say I can not see how it is possible for this provision to do any harm, and it is fraught with much possible good. That being so, it certainly ought to be enacted into law, and I hope the amendment offered by the chairman of the committee and now pending will be adopted. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. McLAUGHLIN] and the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER] have each four minutes remaining.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, last night I called the attention of the committee to the language in the bill largely for the purpose of advising those who have not closely followed the course of these matters of the degree to which the work of the Bureau of Markets is extended, taking in, as I believe, some work that is not properly market work. The speeches that have been made telling of the outrages committed upon shippers by commission merchants can not be answered. There is no doubt of the truth of them. The only question is whether or not it is the duty of the Federal Government to provide relief for everyone who suffers on account of the lack of principle of a party at one end or the other of a contract. As I stated last evening, my principal objection is that we are undertaking to legislate concerning this very important matter in a few lines, a short paragraph, changing, as gentlemen have said, the rules of evidence and the proceedings in court—a matter which should be gone into thoroughly, and concerning which

we should adopt a well-digested, well-considered measure. This change in paragraph does not relate alone to fruits and vegetables, but to all food products. It covers the entire field. When we were considering this matter in the committee I think I suggested—at least, the suggestion was made before the committee—that the one who asked the privilege of having this examination made in his behalf for his protection ought to pay the cost. My recollection is that there was no objection to that, and those words, embodying that idea, were included in the measure as presented to the House by the committee. The paragraph went out on a point of order, and the paragraph presented in its place by the chairman of the committee and held to be in order does not contain those words. I wish to offer an amendment to have those words inserted, so that the one who asks to have this inspection made, for whose benefit and protection it is made, shall pay the cost of the inspection. Otherwise this country may be covered by inspectors, and the expense will grow without limit. It is a business proposition. The one who asks for the service ought to pay for it, and I understand that in other measures similar to this, to which reference has been made and quoted for the purpose of justifying this paragraph, it is provided in every case that the cost of the inspection shall be borne by the one who asks it and for whose benefit it is made.

Mr. Chairman, I present the following amendment and ask that it be considered at the proper time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman proposes an amendment to the amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan: Amend the amendment by adding at the end of the first paragraph, after the word "prescribe," the following words: "including payment of such fees as will cover the cost of the service rendered."

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I have absolutely no objection to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan. That language was contained in the bill when it was presented to the House. It went out on a point of order, and no doubt this language was a part of the language in the item which subjected the whole paragraph to a point of order. Personally I have no objection to this; in fact, I am in favor of it.

If I thought there was any serious attempt to strike this item out of the bill I would feel greatly worried about the situation, but I do not believe there can be any serious attempt in that direction. This proposes to do nothing more or less than to protect the public against thievery and robbery and dishonest dealing in this business of handling vegetables and perishable products. I presume there is no business which offers so many temptations, so many inducements to dishonest dealing, as this business of handling these highly perishable products from the producer to the ultimate consumer.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEVER. Yes.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Ought not the words "other products" to be stricken out?

Mr. LEVER. I should not want to take that responsibility on the floor. What we are attempting to do is, first, to protect the honest man, the merchant who handles these products, against the relatively few dishonest men in the business. Second, we are trying to protect the consumer by assuring him that these perishables will be produced in quantities sufficiently large to enable them to be bought at a reasonable price. In the third place, we are trying to protect the producer against that element of dishonesty in the business against which he has now no protection except under this act. Gentlemen know, as has been pointed out frequently, that the shippers of vegetables and peaches are sometimes called upon to pay the expenses of the shipment when they get the returns. Testimony before the committee shows that one man selling peaches shipped to him from some part of Arkansas to Chicago for 35 cents a bushel, and the same peaches were traced and were sold in Michigan for \$1.20. You ask what we want—how far shall we go—and the gentleman from Michigan suggests that there is dishonesty in all business. That is very true, but it is the duty of this Congress and every legislative body, as far as possible within the bounds of reason, to protect the public against dishonesty wherever it is found, and that is all there is in this proposition. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired; all time has expired. The question is, first, on the amendment to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. McLAUGHLIN], which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of the first paragraph, after the word "prescribed," add the following: "including payment of such fees as will cover the cost of the service rendered."

The question was taken, and the amendment to the amendment was agreed to.



Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment to the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 78, line 3, strike out after the word "other" the word "food," and insert in place thereof the words "perishable farm."

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. All debate on this paragraph and amendments thereto has been closed by order of the committee.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I ask unanimous consent for one minute.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent to proceed for one minute. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, unless this amendment is adopted, the instruction to the Secretary of Agriculture to appoint inspectors to conduct a system of inspection would apply to meat products and to other products included in the word "food," which I think the Committee on Agriculture does not contemplate. If the amendment is adopted, striking out the word "food" and inserting "perishable farm products," it would read "vegetable and other perishable farm products," and would confine the inspection to what I believe the committee has jurisdiction over.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The question was taken, and the amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the proviso.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania: Amend the amendment by striking out all after the word "prescribed."

The question was taken, and the amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER] as amended.

The question was taken, and the amendment as amended was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

For investigating, demonstrating, and promoting the use of standards for the different grades, qualities, and conditions of cotton, and for investigating the ginning grading, stapling, baling, marking, compressing, and tare of cotton, \$45,920: *Provided* That of the sum thus appropriated \$20,960 may be used for testing the waste, tensile strength, and bleaching qualities of the different grades and classes of cotton in order to determine their spinning value and for demonstrating the results of such tests.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. The language of this paragraph would seem to indicate that it was the purpose of the Department of Agriculture to establish standards. I was wondering whether this work was not properly within the purview of the Bureau of Standards.

Mr. LEVER. This work has always been done by the department under the cotton-future act.

Mr. STAFFORD. I am well aware of that, but I am asking whether the work is not more suitable for the Bureau of Standards than it is for the Department of Agriculture. The two departments recognize the difference in their respective fields of activity, the Bureau of Standards not wishing to trench on the chemical analysis or investigation of products, while the establishment of standards is left to the Bureau of Standards.

Mr. LEVER. I do not know when it started, but it seems to have grown up in the Department of Agriculture, the policy of fixing standards, and it does for grain, corn, wheat, and cotton. Practically all of the standardization work touching farm products, as far as I know, is being done by the Department of Agriculture, and I suspect it is in a better position to do it than is the Bureau of Standards, because the Department of Agriculture has more expert knowledge of the matter than has the Bureau of Standards.

Mr. STAFFORD. Only recently have we established standards as far as cereals are concerned. I recognize that the department, as far as wheat and corn and products of the soil is concerned, may be better qualified to establish those standards than the Bureau of Standards.

Mr. LEVER. I do not know what facilities the Bureau of Standards would have, and this has been going on in the department for many years.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 78, line 21. At the end of line 21 add the following: "But no money provided by this act shall be used for the purpose of buying, leasing, or operating any mill, building, machinery, or other property in carrying on the work herein authorized."

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment on which I should like to have five minutes.

Mr. LEVER. Then I shall make it 12 minutes, 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. McLAUGHLIN] and 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] and reserving 2 minutes for myself.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina asks unanimous consent that debate upon this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 12 minutes, 5 minutes to go to the gentleman from Michigan, 5 minutes to the gentleman from Montana, and 2 minutes to himself. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, my amendment is directed particularly to the paragraph for testing the tensile strength and bleaching qualities of cotton, because I believe this kind of work is not a marketing proposition and ought not to be carried on by the Bureau of Markets. The Chief of the Bureau of Markets, in answer to that criticism when he appeared before the committee, stated it would be helpful to the growers of cotton if they could have all information available from any source as to the best kind of cotton to be grown for the market, and that he would carry on the mechanical operations if they can be called that, to test the strength and bleaching qualities of cotton so as to give the advice that would be helpful to the growers of cotton, leading them to produce the kind of cotton that would market best. That is going a long way outside of the functions of the Bureau of Markets, in my judgment. We may as well establish flour mills to determine the milling qualities of different kinds of wheat, so as to arrive at which makes the best flour. Illustrations might be multiplied to show what might be done to give advice to the farmers of this country as to the kinds of crops they should grow and learn what kind would market the best, that work to be carried on by the Bureau of Markets. I do not believe that is a proper function of the Bureau of Markets, and I have suggested this as a limitation upon the activities of the bureau, that they shall not buy nor erect nor operate any mill or factory or proposition to carry on that kind of work. I sincerely believe the committee should agree with me and limit the bureau to its proper activities in making investigations and giving information strictly in regard to marketing, and not go into this line in which it proposes to engage, or may engage, unless this amendment is adopted.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the proviso.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MONDELL: Page 78, line 17, after the figures "\$45,920," strike out the remainder of the paragraph.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, great is king cotton, and tremendously active and effective are its subjects and votaries. We go further in this bill and in other legislation in the promotion of cotton, in aiding the industry in governmental activities affecting it, than in connection with any other product or class of products in the country. It is a great product, and exceedingly important and very valuable, and we should do much to promote and encourage it, but there are certain things relative to cotton which, while they may properly be undertaken by the Government, should not be undertaken on an agricultural bill or by the Agricultural Department, and the activities proposed in this paragraph are of that character. If we are to go into the work of testing the tensile strength and bleaching qualities of this product we ought to go into the work along the same lines regarding wool. It is just as important that we should in one class of products as in the other. Whether it be wool or cotton, however, the work should not be taken up by the Department of Agriculture or carried on by that department. It is properly the work of the Bureau of Standards; possibly, to a certain extent, the work of the Department of Commerce. I do not know that I would object to it; in fact, I am rather inclined to think that I should favor and assist the carrying on of the work in the proper place and under the proper agencies, but the Agricultural Department is not organized for this character of work. The Bureau of Standards is. The Agricultural Department has no business to go into manufacturing questions. That is a matter for other bureaus of the Government, if we are to undertake the work at all. Furthermore, the Bureau of Standards does investigate these questions to a certain extent. I think the bureau might properly do it to a still further extent. The amendment of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. McLAUGHLIN] indicates the danger that the department will go further afield than we contemplate under this provision by starting mills and commercial establishments and manufactories for the purpose of demonstrating these things.

If that is to be done, which is of doubtful wisdom, it certainly should not be undertaken by the Agricultural Department. Let us keep these various activities within the departments of the Government where they properly belong. By so doing we shall be much more likely to get results that are valuable and that are useful. The Agricultural Department has no instruments or instrumentalities or machinery and apparatus to carry on this kind of work. If it had, it should not. Other departments of the Government may have them. It is an investigation plainly outside of the domain of agriculture, outside of the proper activities of the Agricultural Department, relating to commerce, relating to the use of material after it passes out of the hands of the farmer and out of the agricultural domain into the domain of commerce and manufacture. The provisions in this bill should be limited to purely agricultural activities.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] usually speaks with knowledge when he makes a statement on the floor of the House, but in this instance he is speaking absolutely without knowledge of the facts he is undertaking to present. The truth about this matter is that this language has not been changed in the least. It has been carried in this bill to my knowledge for six or eight years. The standardization work of all agricultural products is being done by the Department of Agriculture. So, therefore, I trust the amendment of the gentleman from Wyoming will be voted down, and I trust also that the amendment of the gentleman from Michigan will be voted down. I confess that I do not know just what the gentleman is driving at. There are many, many other provisions in this bill of a like tenor to this that have been already passed and no such limitation has been undertaken to be attached to them. I see no reason for attaching such a limitation to this item in the bill. On the contrary, as far as I know, the Government is operating no mill or factory or gin or anything of the kind in its testing work. I think most of their work is either done in the Department of Agriculture or at certain agricultural colleges in cooperation with those colleges. I hope both amendments will be voted down.

Mr. JUUL. May I be permitted to ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. LEVER. I would be very glad to do so, but all time has expired.

The CHAIRMAN. All time under the order of the committee is closed on this item.

Mr. HAUGEN. I ask that the gentleman may have a minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. JUUL. I just want to ask the gentleman if he would accept an amendment to this section on page 78. I do not want to offer the amendment and have it voted down. On page 78, line 4—

Mr. LEVER. What is it about?

Mr. JUUL. I want to ask the gentleman if he will accept an amendment to insert after the word "received," in line 4, the words "and sold," or "at time of sale."

Mr. LEVER. I will say that has been passed, and the gentleman can not go back to it except by unanimous consent, and somebody will probably object. In addition to that, I would hate to broaden that language without a very full consideration of it by the committee.

Mr. JUUL. I just wanted to submit it to the gentleman.

Mr. LEVER. I would be very glad to have the gentleman discuss the matter with me some time and with the committee.

Mr. JUUL. I know and so does the gentleman, that inspection at the time received and inspection at the time of sale might mean a very different thing in the matter of perishable produce.

Mr. LEVER. That is very true, and I hope the Committee on Agriculture may some time have an opportunity to work out this proposition here in greater detail.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wyoming, which the Clerk will report.

The amendment was again reported.

The question was taken and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer another amendment. Page 78, line 20, after the word "cotton" insert the words "and wool."

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against that amendment that it is not germane to this section.

The CHAIRMAN. Following a decision of the Speaker, without having it at hand, where he held on a bill regulating the sale of futures as to cotton that an amendment regulating grain was not germane and sustained a point of order on it, the Chair will have to sustain the point of order here that wool is not germane to this paragraph. The Chair sustains the point

of order. The Clerk will report the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Michigan.

The amendment was again reported.

The question was taken and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to make studies of cooperation among farmers in the United States in matters of rural credits and of other forms of cooperation in rural communities; to diffuse among the people of the United States useful information growing out of these studies, in order to provide a basis for a broader utilization of results secured by the research, experimental, and demonstration work of the Department of Agriculture, agricultural colleges, and State experiment stations, \$28,280.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MORGAN offers to amend, on page 79, line 5, after the semicolon, by inserting the following:

"Provided, That there is hereby constituted a joint committee of the Senate and House of Representatives, to consist of the chairman of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, the chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture, and the chairmen of the Committees on Banking and Currency of the two Houses, and two other members of each of said committees, to be designated by the chairmen of the respective committees, and it shall be the duty of said joint committee to prepare, after such investigations as may be deemed necessary, and report to the Congress on or before March 1, 1918, a bill providing for the establishment of a system of short-term farm credit adapted to American needs and conditions, and the Secretary of Agriculture, in his discretion, may use not to exceed \$5,000 of the sum appropriated in this paragraph to defray all necessary expenses of said joint committee."

During the reading of the above,

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, the reading of the amendment shows it is clearly subject to the point of order.

Mr. MORGAN. I hope the chairman will let it be read.

Mr. LEVER. If the gentleman desires the amendment read with the reservation of the point of order, I will not object to the gentleman's occupying five minutes.

The reading of the amendment was completed.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina reserves the point of order against the amendment.

Mr. LEVER. For five minutes.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, for the present, not discussing technically whether the point of order is good or not, I want to make an appeal to the able chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER], as well as to other Members of the House who might be inclined to make the point of order, not to insist on it. I know, of course, that the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture is deeply interested in this subject of providing the farmers of the United States with the very best system of credits. I know personally that he would be very glad to see legislation on this subject. He knows the history of rural-credit legislation in the Congress. He knows that it was by virtue of a similar amendment put on the Agricultural appropriation bill approved March 4, 1915, that we finally secured the passage in the Sixty-fourth Congress of a bill creating the system of land credits. I have copied almost exactly the provisions of that act approved March 4, 1915, which created this joint committee. Now, I think that committee is still in existence. I think it is a continuing committee, but I will not discuss that now. The chairman of the Committee on Agriculture was the author, I presume, of the provision which went into the Agricultural appropriation bill of 1915 and largely through his efforts the joint committee of the two Houses on rural credits was created. It reported a bill, which was referred to Committees on Banking and Currency of the two Houses. It made a report and we enacted that law establishing a great system of land credits for the farmers of the United States. But we have not finished that job; we have not completed the task that we have undertaken. We have not kept the pledge that we made to the farmers of the United States.

Here is a very important amendment. Technically it may be out of order, but it is nothing unusual to legislate on appropriation bills. Practically every appropriation bill contains new legislation. And I know of no amendment that should appeal so convincingly to the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture as the one I have presented. So, without taking further time upon this point, I sincerely hope that the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, to whom the farmers of this country are so deeply indebted, will withdraw his point of order or not make the point of order. And I also appeal to every other Member of the House to not make the point of order in case the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture does not do so.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, the speech of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MORGAN] is very powerful, but this is such



an important matter that it should be considered by the proper committee before being acted upon by the Committee of the Whole; and, therefore, I am constrained to make the point of order.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia in the chair). Does the gentleman from Oklahoma desire to discuss the point of order?

Mr. MORGAN. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained. The matter seems to be new legislation.

The gentleman from Oklahoma offers another amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 79, line 5, after the semicolon, insert:

"Provided, That not to exceed 90 per cent of the appropriation received in this paragraph shall be available unless the Secretary of Agriculture shall have on or before March 1, 1918, prepared and submitted to Congress a bill to provide a system of short-term farm credits for the farmers of the United States."

Mr. LEVER. I make a point of order against that, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MORGAN. Well, I would like to be heard on that. I do not think that is subject to a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma is recognized.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, this is a limitation on the appropriation provided in the paragraph. It provides that unless the Secretary of Agriculture, who is authorized to use this appropriation of \$28,280 for the purpose of investigating rural credits, shall on or before the 1st of March, 1918, prepare and submit to Congress a bill to provide a short-term system of farm credits, only 90 per cent of this appropriation shall be used. So I limit and restrict this appropriation by this amendment, and I think that, therefore, it is clearly in order under the rule that provides that amendments which limit appropriations are in order on an appropriation bill.

Mr. WALSH. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MORGAN. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. Does not the gentleman from Oklahoma think that he himself could prepare a better and more comprehensive measure on this subject and introduce it into the House than could be done by the Secretary of Agriculture with his many and manifold duties which he now has to perform in view of this great war emergency?

Mr. MORGAN. Well, the gentleman knows that I am a very, very modest man, and I have no such idea. Why, we have been appropriating large sums of money to the Department of Agriculture, and I have great respect and admiration for the character and the ability of the Secretary of that department. In addition to that, he has a large number of experts under him who have given great study to this question. But, of course, that is not really the point involved in this matter.

Mr. WALSH. Will the gentleman permit me to say that I doubt if any of his experts are any more interested or perhaps better equipped to express an opinion in the form of a measure than is the gentleman from Oklahoma, who has given years of study to this work?

Mr. MORGAN. I certainly appreciate the very kind words of my friend from Massachusetts.

So that, Mr. Chairman, the amendment which I propose will reduce the amount upon the happening of a certain event. Under the rule, I understand, such an amendment is in order.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, hearing the amendment read only from the desk, I take it that, in the guise of a limitation, it is really a direction to the Secretary of Agriculture to prepare a bill and submit it to Congress and, if so—and I have heard correctly the amendment—then it is clearly subject to a point of order and is not a limitation, but is a direction in the guise of a limitation.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, the present occupant of the chair is entirely familiar with these parliamentary questions, and he knows perfectly well that it is not his province to go speculating as to what may be the intent of the limitation. He must judge of the limitation as it is presented to him. This is a provision to the effect that only a certain portion of the appropriation shall be expended, except and contingent upon a certain act being performed. Such a limitation is entirely proper and clearly within the rule, a portion of the expenditure being contingent upon the establishment of a certain condition or situation. Where that shall have occurred, then the entire sum may be used. If it does not, only 90 per cent of it is to be used.

Mr. SLOAN. Mr. Chairman, I desire to raise another point of order against the proposition, more important, in my opinion,

than the one that has been raised, and that is this: The amendment provides a direction to the head of an executive department to prepare a bill for consideration and passage by this House. In other words, it directs that the head of a department shall usurp part of the function of this, the legislative department of the Government, in drafting a bill—a feature of legislation usually as important as any other part of it. It should not be the function of the head of any department or any person connected with the Government in any way, except a Member of this House or a Member of the coordinate body, to prepare legislation for the consideration of this House or that body, and I object here and now.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I object just as much as the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. SLOAN] possibly can to the purpose of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MORGAN], who is inviting a practice which is not in harmony with our institutions, which has been infinitely harmful, under which there has been a usurpation of the prerogatives of the House, and which no Member of the House should seek to encourage, but rather to discourage. I disapprove as much as anyone possibly can the purpose of the gentleman from Oklahoma of allowing or inviting or suggesting that an executive officer should prepare legislation for us. But that proposition does not go to the question of the point of order.

Mr. SLOAN. Well, it goes, if I understand it, Mr. Chairman, to the point of order that I raised. I understand that there is a proposition raised here, and that we are not confined to one point of order, but may submit as many objections on the ground of lack of being in order as we see fit, and that is the reason why I have submitted that one.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. Is not the gentleman aware of the fact that during this present emergency the Members of the House have apparently waived the prerogatives we have in the production of measures bearing on the emergency, and that it is now the custom for them to be prepared in the various departments and sent down here for our consideration?

Mr. SLOAN. The proof of the existence of a bad custom is no reason for the continuation of that bad custom, and the question may just as well be raised now as later. The waiver in one instance is no proof or reason why it should be waived again.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SLOAN. Yes.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I understand, then, that the gentleman concludes that Congress has not permanently abdicated its functions.

Mr. SLOAN. I hope not; and I hope that that hope will grow into a conclusion that we have not abdicated our functions. [Applause.]

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, of course the questions involved in this point of order have nothing to do with the merits of the proposition offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MORGAN]. The mere fact, however, that the amendment takes the form of a limitation upon the appropriation does not bring that amendment within the rule of the House which permits legislation in the form of a limitation upon an appropriation bill.

It is well established that the limitation must be a limitation upon the expenditure of the money itself, upon the method of expending the money, and that that limitation can not go to the point of directing the executive functions of an executive officer.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON. I yield for a question.

Mr. MORGAN. Is it not a fact that this does not direct the Secretary to do anything, but simply leaves it to his discretion? It does not compel him. If he does not do this, then he can only use 90 per cent of this money.

Mr. ANDERSON. The mere fact that it is discretionary does not affect the character of the amendment at all. It is an attempt by a so-called limitation to direct or to interfere with the executive functions of an executive officer. I call the Chairman's attention to the precedent cited in the fourth volume of Hinds' Precedents, from section 3957 to 3966, many of which, it seems to me, are in point on this proposition and are conclusive against the contention of the gentleman from Oklahoma that this so-called limitation is in order.

The CHAIRMAN. The rule in relation to amendments of this character may be stated in brief, as follows: Such an amendment, to be in order, must be a negative prohibition upon the expenditure of money, and not in substance an affirmative direction to an executive officer. The House may by limitation

on a general appropriation bill forbid the use of money for a specific service, but it may not grant the appropriation for the general service on condition that an executive officer shall take a certain course in connection with the service. (IV Hinds, pp. 660-672.)

Now it is perfectly clear to the Chair that the effect of the proposed amendment is to compel an executive officer to do a certain thing not related to this paragraph, as a condition precedent to securing the benefit of the fund appropriated in this connection. He is required to write a bill on a particular subject. The amendment is in effect an affirmative direction to that effect, requiring the Secretary of Agriculture to prepare and submit to Congress before March 1, 1918, a bill providing a farm-credit system, or else lose the benefit of a portion of this appropriation. The amendment is in the form of a limitation, but is more affirmative than negative in its character. Not being a limitation, it is not protected by the rule relating to limitations.

The point of order is sustained.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I send up an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MORGAN: Page 79, line 5, after the semicolon, insert the following:

"Provided, That not to exceed 90 per cent of the amount appropriated in this paragraph shall be available unless the Joint Committee on Rural Credits appointed by the act approved March 4, 1915, entitled 'An act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916,' shall have, on or before March 1, 1918, prepared and reported to Congress a bill establishing a system of short-term farm credits."

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order on that.

Mr. MORGAN. I would like to be heard for a moment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma is recognized.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, the act approved March 4, 1915, contains the following paragraph:

That there is hereby constituted a joint committee of the Senate and House of Representatives, to consist of the chairman of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, the chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture, and the chairmen of the Committees on Banking and Currency of the two Houses, and two other members of each of said committees, to be designated by the chairmen of the respective committees, and it shall be the duty of said joint committee to prepare, after such investigations as may be deemed necessary, and report to the Congress on or before January 1, 1916, a bill or bills providing for the establishment of a system of rural credits adapted to American needs and conditions. The sum of \$10,000 is hereby appropriated, the same to be immediately available, out of any funds in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to defray all necessary expenses of said joint committee, payment of said expenses to be made upon vouchers approved by the chairman of said joint committee, who shall be selected by the committee.

Mr. Chairman, that is not a rule of the House, but an act of Congress, which created a joint committee on rural credits, requiring that committee to report a bill or bills on that subject. That committee was created by the Sixty-third Congress. It acted during the Sixty-fourth Congress, and I maintain that that committee is still in existence, because the act names who shall be on that committee. So we have to-day under that law a Joint Committee on Rural Credits, authorized to act upon this subject. Now, my amendment simply limits the appropriation to 90 per cent unless that committee which is now in existence shall make an additional report. The Chair will take judicial notice, so to speak, of the fact that this committee has only partially completed its work. As I say, it was created by an act of the Sixty-third Congress. The committee acted and expended their money during the Sixty-fourth Congress. I do not know whether all of that \$10,000 was expended or not, but I will assume that the committee did not expend it all. I do know from personal knowledge that it was during the Sixty-fourth Congress that the committee did all their work. I want to know why that committee is not in existence to-day, and if it is in existence, why it is not a proper amendment to limit this appropriation unless there is a report of that joint committee which is now in existence, not by virtue of a rule but by virtue of an act of Congress passed by the two Houses and approved by the President. That act is upon the statute books to-day. It never has been repealed. I want to know why that committee can not act to-day, and why this limitation is not proper under the rule. I hope that the Chair on investigation will conclude that that committee is in existence, and that they can act to-day, and that my amendment is proper under the rule.

The CHAIRMAN. There are a great many precedents in this connection, for this question of order has been ruled on time and again. The Chair will read one citation before announcing his ruling.

On February 15, 1907, the naval appropriation bill was under consideration in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and Mr. WEBB of North Carolina offered the following amendment, as a limitation.

Add after the word "act" in line 14, page 81: "Provided, That before the construction of these vessels shall be begun, a test shall be made with the service 12-inch projectile fired against a 12-inch Krupp armor plate at a range of 5,000 yards, to ascertain whether such projectile fired with service pressure will penetrate such armor plate."

This amendment proposed to make the appropriation contingent upon the test provided. It was offered as a limitation. A point of order was made against it, and sustained. Now the amendment under consideration proposes that the benefit of the appropriation included in this paragraph shall not be enjoyed by the Department of Agriculture until a certain committee shall do a certain thing. This committee was required to report on, or before a certain date. To be definite on or before January 1, 1916. That time has passed.

Mr. MORGAN. It did not do so.

The CHAIRMAN. The question very naturally arises whether that committee can now make a report. Having failed to discharge the duty imposed by the act that created it, the committee is in the judgment of the Chair, functus officio, and no longer capable of reporting. This amendment therefore proposes to make the benefit of the appropriation in this paragraph contingent upon the action of a committee which is without power to act. It is therefore not, fairly speaking, a limitation at all. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I regret very much that a point of order was sustained against each of the amendments which I have offered. I regret that the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Agriculture felt that it was his duty to make the points of order. Under my pro forma amendment I wish to say a few words about short-term farm credit. Here is an appropriation of \$28,280, supposed to be largely for the purpose of having the Department of Agriculture investigate rural credits. If you will go back for several preceding Congresses you will find that this same appropriation has been in this bill. It is a question whether such appropriation ought to be made unless the Department of Agriculture actually produces results. We want results, not mere investigations. Now, I have been through the reports of the Secretary of Agriculture, going back five or six years. So far the Secretary of Agriculture has proposed no concrete plan for short-term farm credit. He no doubt has accumulated much information on the subject. But what good does that do, if Congress does not act on the information. We have an abundance of information now. We are prepared to act. The Secretary of Agriculture is no doubt prepared to submit a plan. This would be a basis for action. There is no practical advantage in adding to the store of information in the minds of the rural credit experts in the Agricultural Department if we can not utilize that knowledge to some practical purpose and make it contribute to the prosperity of the farmers and the general prosperity of the whole country. The time has come when we should call upon the Secretary of Agriculture to present a definite plan. The plan or plans suggested could be acted upon by the Committees on Banking and Currency of the two Houses. These committees could report thereon and the Congress could act. By this course the thousands of dollars we are appropriating would bring practical results.

It is admitted by all that an increased production of food products is essential to the winning of the war. But what has the National Government done, through legislative or by Executive action to equip the farmers for larger production?

If the farmers are to enlarge their business and extend their farming operations, they must have better credit facilities. Credit is a factor in the business of farming as it is in industrial and commercial pursuits.

Why should not Congress proceed at the earliest date possible to complete our rural-credit system by creating a short-term credit system that will enable the farmers to secure short-time loans at a low rate of interest and upon favorable terms? In certain sections of the West there was a failure of the wheat crops last year. Seed wheat was high. It required a large amount of money to buy this seed wheat. The farmers did not have the money. The local banks did not have it. The farmers needed credit, but the credit was not obtainable. The result was, in certain sections of the West, the wheat acreage was reduced rather than enlarged. All because Congress had not established a short-term farm credit system through which the farmers might have obtained ample credit to purchase seed and improve their equipment for farming.

Mr. WALSH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORGAN. Yes.



Mr. WALSH. What sort of proof does the gentleman think ought to be required to show that the farmers are receiving real benefit from the legislation enacted in their interest?

Mr. MORGAN. I think there ought to be some other proof than the fact that we are appropriating the money and that the number of department employees is increasing.

I noticed the other day that the Secretary of the Treasury proposed to create a great corporation, with a capital of \$500,000,000 to help finance business corporations which were engaged in producing munitions of war, or things necessary to win the war. We have assumed control of the railroads and must finance them. But nobody seems to recognize the importance of financing the farmers. It is true Congress, by the act of July 17, 1916, established a new system of long-time mortgage credit. But this is in its infancy and is unsuited to supplying the farmers with credit for the purchase of seed and implements and in the employment of labor. I maintain that to provide our farmers with a short-term farm credit system is a war measure. It should be acted upon promptly to give our farmers the benefit of it for the season of 1918.

Notwithstanding the fact that my amendments have been ruled out of order on this bill, I sincerely hope Congress may see the wisdom of my suggestions and act favorably thereon at an early date.

Further, I wish to say that I have introduced in the House House bill 8827, to provide a system of short-term credit for the farmers of the United States. It, in my judgment, would prove to be of immense benefit not only to our farmers but the public generally. It would encourage our farmers and enable them to enlarge the amount of their annual products, both through an enlarged acreage in cultivation and by doing better farming. While this would, to an extent, increase the earnings of the farmers, it would insure our own people and our allies with the necessary food to win the gigantic war in which we are engaged.

The Clerk read as follows:

To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to cooperate with the several States in the employment of agents to acquire and diffuse useful information connected with the distribution and marketing of farm products through investigational, demonstrational, or extension methods, \$61,500.

Mr. ROBBINS. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 79, line 10, after the word "methods," insert the following: "And for the purpose of procuring labor to plant and harvest the crops for the year 1918 on the farms of the United States, \$261,500."

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the amendment.

Mr. ROBBINS. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I have gone through this bill, covering 89 pages and appropriating \$26,943,773 for the benefit of agriculture, so denominated, and yet I find not one line or provision to meet the greatest emergency that exists in the country against the American farmer to-day—that is the scarcity of labor. I am compelled to occupy the time of this committee for a few moments to call attention to some information that was sent to me from the State board of agriculture which met at Harrisburg, in my native State of Pennsylvania, last week:

218,000 STATE FARMS LOOKING FOR LABORERS—MEMBERS OF BOARD OF AGRICULTURE PREDICT DECREASED PRODUCTION.

HARRISBURG, PA., January 24, 1918.

Resolutions adopted by the State board of agriculture at the joint meeting of the board and allied bodies last night, declaring that the draft should be extended to include people in all walks of life, and that there should be conscription of labor if necessary to see that hands are provided for the farms, will be sent to the national authorities at Washington. Conferences of men active in the board were held to-day with a view of ascertaining what steps should be taken to secure men, and representative farmers will likely go to Washington.

The speeches at the closing session of the board and at the joint meeting dealt with conditions which speakers declared would be alarming on the farms this year. Predictions of decreased production instead of an increase as asked were freely made.

On the same date at an agricultural convention in Blair County, which is just east of and almost adjoining the county in which I live, in the district which I represent, this statement appears:

31 FARMERS TO QUIT BUSINESS—LABOR SHORTAGE FORCES BLAIR COUNTY MEN TO SELL LANDS—BEDFORD COUNTY HIT.

ALTOONA, PA., January 23, 1918.

Thirty-one farmers residing in the southern end of Blair County are advertising their stock and implements for sale and preparing to go out of business by next April. Among the farms are some of the largest and best in Blair County, in the rich agricultural belt of the Morrisons Cove, a producing section surpassed by Lancaster County only.

A few of the farmers have made sufficient money to retire, but almost all are discontinuing farming because they have not sufficient help.

The same condition exists in Bedford County. It is estimated there will be a 10 per cent reduction in operating farms in Blair County by next April.

This situation is acute in Pennsylvania. It is so in all the Eastern States, and this is the reason of it: Large wages are paid in ammunition factories, at the coal mines, and in various industries, and these public works have drained the farms of the ordinary labor that was employed in that occupation. On top of that came along this selective draft, taking away the farmers' sons, so that there is no one left to operate the farms.

What are the remedies that are offered—and I have listened to the debate here while this bill has been discussed for six days past—and what suggestion has been made to meet this exigency? Four remedies are mentioned: First, it was suggested that we take the boys and girls from the towns and put them on the farms as volunteers to do the farm work. That was tried last year and proved a failure. It would not work. And, second, some patriot has brought forth the proposition that we employ and bring over a great quantity of cheap labor from China and operate our farms by Chinese coolie labor, but that is met with opposition by residents of the Pacific coast; they will not tolerate that kind of labor in competition with American workmen in the United States. A third suggestion made is the one I saw in the Official Bulletin, issued by George Creel, which we all read or do not read, as the case may be, that they propose to bring over 100,000 laborers from Porto Rico and perform our farm labor by aid of these new citizens. I congratulate my friends from the South upon this proposal, because they know very well that no Porto Rican would ever come north to work on an American farm. He would go to Florida or some State near the Gulf and grow lettuce or crocus bulbs and that would be the extent of his farming. Porto Ricans have no knowledge of farming as this industry is conducted in the United States. There is a fourth method suggested by the State Agricultural Board of Pennsylvania, as indicated by the resolution above quoted, that I think is entitled to the serious consideration of this Congress, and it is entitled to the thoughtful consideration of any man on this floor who represents a farming constituency and who wants to take care of their interests in this bill. That is the plan by which we will draft every man, woman, and child in all walks of life between the ages of 16—I fix the age at 16 because under the laws of Pennsylvania and most of the States we can not force anyone under 16 to work; they should go to school—and 60 years of age. Not to force them arbitrarily to work, not by compelling them to labor, but to take stock of our man power from which we can draw labor to use on the farm, if they are willing to farm, during the summer of 1918. This appropriation—and I appeal to the chairman who represents the majority party in this House—is necessary, every dollar of it, but we must add to it a sum large enough to enable the department to send this labor when thus mobilized to the farms where it is needed. The President of the United States in addressing the farmers of Illinois yesterday appealed to them to increase the production of the farms of our country, but he is singularly silent as to where the labor is to be procured to plant the crop and cultivate and harvest the same during the coming season.

The President states in an admirable address to the farmers, delivered yesterday at the University of Illinois, as follows:

And their response to the demands of the present emergency has been in every way remarkable. Last spring their planting exceeded by 12,000,000 acres the largest planting of any previous year, and the yields from the crops were record-breaking yields.

In the fall of 1917 a wheat acreage of 42,170,000 was planted, which was 1,000,000 larger than for any preceding year, 3,000,000 greater than the next largest, and 7,000,000 greater than the preceding five-year average.

But I ought to say to you that it is not only necessary that these achievements should be repeated, but that they should be exceeded.

How is the American farmer to meet this clarion call to high duty, with the demand for labor to help him growing more exasperating with each passing day? Is the Department of Agriculture going to come to his relief by aiding him in securing laborers? Not one cent of all the millions here appropriated is to be used for this imperative purpose. The farmer is invited to perform a greater task in 1918 than he did in 1917 with far less hands to do the work. He can not do it. Furthermore in this address we find this consolation for the farmer:

Farmers have not been exempted from the draft. I know that they would not wish to be. I take it for granted they would not wish to be put in a class by themselves in this respect.

Of course, the farmers do not wish to be placed in a class and branded as that part of our people who seek to avoid the draft for occupational reasons. The farmers are patriotic. They have always been patriotic. In all our wars the farmers of our country have been our first and greatest defenders. They will be such in this war. But we must not allow their love of country and patriotic zeal to cause them to leave the farms to such an extent as to cause a shortage of food for ourselves and our

allies, and endanger the success of our gallant soldiers in their battle for liberty.

What then is the farmer to do but turn, as I now urge, to the Department of Agriculture for help? Are we going to deny our farmers this relief? I sincerely hope not.

Mr. Chairman, the President of the United States in his address further adds—

In certain agricultural sections despair prevails over the scarcity of labor. Farmers have said they could see no prospect of planting new crops this year or of harvesting them if they did so—

from which it appears that the President is alive to the crisis that confronts the American farmer. The President's suggestion is that in the second draft the key men who are engaged in agricultural pursuits will be exempt, and that only the ordinary farm laborer will be taken off the farm. This will not supply the deficiency that now exists. The draft that has already been enforced has taken the farmers and farmer boys to such an extent that the scarcity of labor has been accentuated throughout all the agricultural districts of the country, and this to such an extent that farmers are giving up their farms. They were scarcely able to harvest their crops last summer, and they will not face another such period of hardship, trial, and disappointment, and they can not be expected to do so.

This condition of our farming community imposes upon us, as national legislators, an imperative duty. We must act. We must remember, and be guided by this principle that "that is the best Government which desires to make the people happy, and knows how to make them happy."

Farmer boys pleaded earnestly with the exemption boards, either for a stay of the draft or for exemption on account of occupation, and they were almost uniformly refused; hence they will take no chances on the future draft. Those that are left do not expect to receive any better consideration in the future than their brothers have in the past.

Another suggestion made by the President is as follows:

#### 200,000 SOLDIERS TO HELP.

At harvest time 200,000 soldiers are to be furloughed to return to the farms and assist in the gathering of the crops. In some sections of the United States the wheat harvest begins in May, so that some of the men now in the camps may be called upon in part for this service before going to France.

And this will prove futile for the reason that Pennsylvania alone will require a greater number on the farms than the 200,000 which it proposes to release. The President does not seem to comprehend the extent and magnitude and the insurmountable difficulties that exist in the rural communities because of the scarcity of labor.

Near industrial centers the men have simply forsaken the farms. In the counties of Westmoreland and Butler, in western Pennsylvania, which I have the honor to represent, the ordinary laborer at a coal mine is paid \$5 per day; a miner with little skill or experience can earn from \$5 to \$15 per day. The boy who drives the mule in the mine is allowed \$5.15 per day. In the large industrial plants where munitions are made the ordinary mechanic can earn \$10 per day; and, although the cost of living is high, these liberal wages have attracted the labor from the farms, and only those who own the land now cling to its cultivation as a means of livelihood. The tenant class and those who work by the month on farms and the day laborers have removed from the land and have gone into industrial employment.

Mr. Chairman, it is not a question of future speculation, it is a question of meeting the irrepressible condition, that now confronts the American farmer and is driving him from his regular avocation; but the critical side of this situation is not confined alone to the farmer. The wheat crop was short last year and the corn crop did not mature well, and we are now engaged in devising means to piece out the wheat crop so that we may have bread, or war bread, until the new harvest comes in July. We must not only feed the American people and the American Army but we must feed the armies of our allies in England, France, and Italy, and they must have the best, because they are now fighting our war; and, in addition to this, the population of England, France, Italy, and even Norway, Sweden, Denmark, and Spain are drawing on us heavily for food, and will continue to draw on us until normal peace conditions come again.

What, therefore, will it profit us to arm and equip one and one-half million men and send them to Europe and have one and one-half million men more in training camps if we are unable to ration them in the field and feed them while training here at home.

If America has fallen down in her military preparations, as Democratic Senators have repeatedly asserted, in my judgment we are now about to fall down in our food production.

Statistics from my own State of Pennsylvania show it, and our farmers in convention as above quoted aver it, and I venture to assert that the same conditions exist in every State east of the Mississippi River, and especially in the great industrial Eastern and Middle States.

What is the use, Mr. Chairman, of appropriating almost \$27,000,000 for various purposes and schemes in this Agricultural bill when we overlook the one great need of governmental assistance and aid in procuring laborers for the farmer?

For instance, we are here appropriating \$1,900,000 for the Weather Bureau, \$5,700,000 for the Forestry Service, \$1,200,000 for the Bureau of Chemistry, \$1,900,000 for the Bureau of Markets, and \$3,150,000 for the States Relations Service and not one penny to obtain labor or labor-saving machinery for our farmers to assist them in planting their crops, cultivating and caring for the same, and harvesting them when matured. It is proposed by this amendment to divert only \$261,500 from being used "to acquire information about the distribution and marketing the farm products," to obtaining laborers for the farmers to relieve them in their dire distress, and the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, from South Carolina, raises a point of order, and the chairman of the Committee of the Whole House, from Virginia, rules it out of order. Such being the case, there is little relief for the farmer in this sort of legislation, in my opinion.

Truly the South is in the saddle and "we are riding for a fall."

Forestry can wait. States Relations Service can stop. The Bureau of Markets can give up a portion of its millions. The patient, patriotic American farmer needs part of these millions to help him in his stupendous task of feeding the world in arms. We must win this war, and our prime necessity is food.

Mr. Chairman, I think there should have been \$5,000,000 appropriated for this purpose in this bill, and cut down some of the other appropriations mentioned above, and placed in the hands of the Secretary of Agriculture with explicit instructions that he secure farm laborers, wherever he could get them, to be engaged on the farms of the United States until the war is over and then transport them back to the place from whence they came. Some of these laborers might be procured in western Canada, some of them in Porto Rico, some of them in Mexico, and a vast number of them in the large cities of America. This plan will not draw labor from any organized industry, or take a single man or woman from the ranks of organized labor. It applies solely and entirely to the great body of people in our large cities who are either unemployed, or work in unessential employments, from which they can be easily spared during this short emergency for this great purpose.

In this discussion, Mr. Chairman, there is another matter that is pressing for the attention of Congress. In connection with this situation, the young farmer boys and others that remain at home, even though they may be exempted, as the President suggests, feel the stigma and disgrace at being pointed out and called slackers. Our draft law was passed for the purpose of mobilizing the whole Nation for the purpose of war, and it should be amended and extended, so that it would include every man, woman, and child between the ages of 16 and 60, and all those who are physically able to bear arms should be drafted between the ages of 21 and 30, and the others, when physically able, given industrial employment necessary to sustain the Army. Those that are sent into the mills and factories to manufacture munitions and other supplies, and those that are sent into transportation lines, to transport the same, and those that are sent back to the farms, to produce the most essential commodity of all, namely, the food supply of the Nation, should all be entitled to wear a badge inscribed with the words, "United States service, special detail," and they should have a uniform to wear when they are off duty, with their friends, in the towns, or about their homes, on off days and in the evenings, and they should be required to wear these uniforms. By this means it would become generally known, and it would be well understood, that all are soldiers and all are serving the country, only in different pursuits, and in different occupations, and the stigma and disgrace of being at home would be removed entirely, and we would be truly a united people, all serving alike our common country.

Mr. Chairman, out of this great mass of people between the ages of 16 and 60 we would be able to have sufficient laborers to cultivate our farms, to operate our mills and factories, and to carry on our great lines of transportation and all other business necessary in the time of war, and the American farmer, who is now hard pressed and is our most neglected citizen, would be relieved of his unbearable burden, and would be elevated again to the place he has hitherto occupied, as the leader in our greatest industrial pursuit.



Mr. Chairman, this movement from the land to the towns and cities which is taking place with increased volume each year has produced an alarming situation in the United States. So imperceptibly has it occurred that the danger produced thereby has not yet become apparent to our people.

The war has challenged attention to it for the first time. Buckley in his great work of civilization states that the first evidence of decay of the great nations of the past occurred when the farmers deserted the soil and turned to city life and industrial pursuits.

Rome's fall dated from the time when the farms of the Pyrennes were deserted by the farmers' sons, who joined the Roman legions or settled in Rome, and became part of the Roman rabble that clamored only for "bread and the circus."

The United States Government must now face this growing menace. We have registered our industries, and they are under Government control. The President has taken over our systems of transportation, and they are operated by a Director General of Railroads. Our greatest industry, our most essential source of production, namely, our farms, are as yet entirely neglected. With the cities of the United States full of men and women who could work on the farms, if properly registered, directed and controlled, no step has been taken toward registering and systematizing this source of labor, and yet the entire farming community of the United States is short of labor to such an extent that farms are being abandoned, cultivation is declining, and production of food is rapidly diminishing.

Mr. Chairman, this annual appropriation bill for the Department of Agriculture is the place, and this is the time, to start a great movement to correct this trouble, and to start the means to prevent this approaching calamity.

If we are to win this war quickly, as we will ultimately win it, if we are to support our soldiers in the field with food, clothing, medicine, and other supplies, we must start earnestly and at once this movement back to the land, and we must register the great body of our men and women who can be spared to help during the war in this great work of increasing the food supply of the world, and this must be done during the summer of 1918. If we help our farmers by the legislation I here propose, we will bring back to them the happy days and prosperous times of which Macauley speaks when he says:

Then none was for a party;  
Then all were for the State;  
Then the great men helped the poor,  
And the poor man loved the great;  
Then lands were fairly portioned;  
Then spoils were fairly sold;  
The Romans were like brothers  
In the brave day of old.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I do not want to be heard on the point of order because I think it is self-evident.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. ROBBINS. I have said everything I wish to say, Mr. Chairman, except that I want leave to extend and revise my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman contend there is authority in the law for this amendment?

Mr. ROBBINS. Mr. Chairman, the amendment makes no change, except that it gives \$200,000 more to be used for this purpose. It simply adds that to the provisions of this section, which, if the Chair will read, he will see is germane to the amendment. The section provides for the employment of agents to acquire and diffuse useful information in connection with the distribution and marketing of farm products through investigational, demonstrational, or extension methods, and the amendment I have proposed simply means that that investigation shall be carried forward for the purpose of securing farm labor. It is certainly germane to the purpose of the section and it ought not to go out on that ground on a point of order. If it is to go out upon the ground that it increases the appropriation, then I shall willingly permit the \$200,000 to be stricken out and allow it to stand at \$61,500, and then allow the Secretary to use any part of the appropriation he pleases for this purpose, because I believe this great outcry for labor will become so pressing that the Secretary will use all this money for that purpose and not for the other purposes.

The CHAIRMAN. This amendment proposes to give the Secretary authority to procure and pay for labor to work on the farms. Does the gentleman maintain that there is any authority in existing law under which the Secretary can do that? If there is not, then, of course, this plainly enlarges his power and would be out of order.

Mr. ROBBINS. It brings the department under this provision, to make investigation and report and open the way for increasing the labor on the farms. Under some authority of law he proposes to import from Porto Rico labor to the extent of 106,000 men.

The CHAIRMAN. But this is authority to the Secretary of Agriculture to procure and pay for labor. It is not an investigation, but is to furnish labor on the farms. The gentleman can not cite me to any statute that gives that authority. Of course the amendment is legislation and is plainly out of order.

Mr. ROBBINS. I do not have any statute to cite to the chairman. I am not aware that there is any.

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Chairman, I think perhaps the Chair misinterprets the amendment. It does not give the authority, as I understand it, to the Secretary to procure labor or do anything of that kind but merely to inquire into the best methods of doing it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will read the amendment:

And for the purpose of procuring labor to plant and harvest the crops for the year 1918 on the farms of the United States.

That is to be inserted after line 10, on page 79.

Mr. ROBBINS. Mr. Chairman, it is just enlarging the duty of these agents. That is the purpose of it. The Chairman is putting a construction upon it that I did not have in mind. In addition to this investigation which they are making, acquiring and diffusing information, my amendment provides that they shall also inquire where labor can be procured.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBBINS. Yes.

Mr. LEVER. I take it the Chair is trying to ascertain if there is any law which authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to procure labor for any purpose. There is no such law.

Mr. ROBBINS. That is not the purpose of this amendment. These agents are to inquire where it can be procured. If they can report that 500,000 men can be procured in Porto Rico or 1,000 men in Mexico or 10,000 men in western Canada, then this provides that an investigation shall be made and these facts reported and steps taken to get this labor, and the American farmer relieved from his present perilous situation. It is not that the Secretary of Agriculture is to hire men to do the harvesting.

Mr. LEVER. The Secretary of Agriculture would not have the authority unless we give it to him to make that kind of an inquiry.

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Chairman, of course, the language is that this amount shall be expended to acquire and diffuse information. "To acquire," of course, is a very broad term, also "to diffuse" is a broad term, and "useful information" is also a broad term. If in any way this amendment merely adds to this statement particulars which are within the general and broad terms used, of course, it is not subject to the point of order. If the Chair interprets it as granting actually an extension of powers to the Secretary to secure labor, I grant that it would be subject to the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa correctly states the principle. If this amendment was merely intended to afford the means to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to enlarge his activities in this connection, without enlarging his powers, the amendment would be plainly in order. If it goes further and affords additional powers to the Secretary it is new legislation and is out of order. The Chair will again read the amendment:

And for the purpose of procuring labor to plant and harvest the crops for the year 1918 on the farms of the United States, \$261,500.

It is apparent to the Chair that the amendment extends authority to the Secretary of Agriculture in excess of that contemplated by the paragraph, and the gentleman must reframe his amendment to make it in order. The point of order to the amendment in its present form is sustained.

Mr. ROBBINS. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 79, line 9, after the word "products" insert the following: "and the procuring of farm labor."

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against that amendment on two grounds. First, it is not germane to the section of the bill and in the second place it is not authorized by law. I desire to call the attention of the Chair to the fact that the authority given to the Secretary of Agriculture is contained in the organic act creating that department, and I shall read that for the information of the Chair:

There shall be at the seat of government a Department of Agriculture, the general design and duties of which shall be to acquire and diffuse among the people of the United States useful information on

subjects connected with agriculture in the most general and comprehensive sense of that word, and to procure, propagate, and distribute among the people new and valuable seeds and plants.

Now, of course, I know that labor is very vital to agriculture, but it is not any more vital to agriculture than it is to manufacture. I have never seen in my connection with this bill the authority of the fundamental act stretched to any such limit as this. In the second place, this proposition would not be germane to this paragraph because this paragraph deals entirely with the proposition of the employment of agents to acquire, disseminate, and diffuse useful information connected with the distribution and marketing of farm products through certain methods.

Now, the gentleman's amendment proposes that we shall procure information about farm labor. Certainly the two propositions are not related to each other and can not be germane. I insist upon the point of order.

Mr. ROBBINS. Mr. Chairman, I think the amendment offered is entirely germane, and in order to test the proposition and determine accurately we must look at the clause in which it appears and the purpose of the clause. Now, the clause reads thus:

To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to cooperate with the several States in the employment of agents to acquire and diffuse information connected with—

What?—

with the distribution and marketing of farm products—

And now comes the amendment—

and the procurement of farm labor through investigational, demonstrational, or extensional methods.

Why is not that a germane amendment to the proposition in this clause? It does not put in anything that is new. It certainly does not disturb the existing provisions of the bill. It gives to these agents one additional duty, not new or unrelated to those already delegated, but a duty connected with farming. This investigation is concerned with farms. The labor that is proposed to be considered is farm labor. It is germane, and it is certainly pertinent and it is certainly in point with the very purpose of this section. Why is it not proper to insert it here? I need not advert to the great merits of the proposition, because it is not necessary; but I do impress upon the Chairman not to send it out on a point of order on the ground argued by the gentleman—that it is not germane to the purpose of the section. It is most pertinent and most germane to ascertain not only how these farm products are to be marketed but ascertain the labor that is to be used in connection therewith, whether for planting, harvesting, or marketing the same. I deny that it is not a germane proposition, and I ask the Chair to sustain it and not send it out on a point of order.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, only a few minutes ago, in the consideration of the second paragraph on page 78, when the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] offered an amendment, after the word "cotton," in line 20, to insert the words "and wool," the then occupant of the chair, the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole, held that it was out of order, and for this reason, that the Speaker of the House had on many occasions decided that you could not add a different provision to that incorporated in a paragraph where it related to only one subject matter. The point now made by the chairman of the committee that it is not germane applies to this amendment here, because this amendment seeks to extend the activities of this Bureau of Markets to a different subject other than that provided by this paragraph. In its present phraseology that is the only authority that this bureau has for the performance of this duty. It is limited to the extent of information connected with the distribution and marketing of farm products. Now it is proposed to extend that activity to the extent of procuring farm labor. The chairman of the committee has called the attention of the Chair to the organic act on which all this legislation is fundamentally based, that it is limited to acquiring and diffusing among the people useful information on subjects connected with agriculture. I wish to call the attention of the Chair in construing that authority to the fact that the Congress has since then created a department, first, of Commerce and Labor, and later divided that department into two—one the Department of Commerce and the other the Department of Labor—and there is at the present time authority in the Department of Labor to perform this very useful work and it is now being carried on. So in the construction by the Chair of that activity or the function of the respective departments the Chair should take into consideration the authority that is vested in the Department of Agriculture and the authority that is vested in the Department of Labor. I respectfully submit, as suggested by the chairman of the committee, that there is no authority in law under the Department of Agriculture to give

this additional authority to the Bureau of Markets and, further, that it is not germane.

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Chairman, if the Chair will pardon me for a moment. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] states that the Chair rightfully held that to add "wool" to "cotton" in the provision that was under consideration a short time ago was not germane for the reason that another subject could not be added. The gentleman is correct about the judgment of the Chair being correct, but it is upon another ground. It has been held, and it is well established, that when one item is contained in a bill another item may not be added to it. If, however, two items are contained in a bill then another item may be added to it. The proposition is not that items may not be added, but the proposition is as to when and under what circumstances items may be added. I suggest for the Chair's consideration this thought: It is true that in the provisions of this paragraph and in the provisions of the fundamental law which establishes the Department of Agriculture it gives authority to the Secretary to acquire and diffuse useful information regarding subjects connected with agriculture. Now, there is nothing outside of that domain that is suggested by this amendment. When gentlemen say that labor is a subject outside the domain of agriculture, certainly gentlemen do not understand of what agriculture consists. To an extent that does not exist in another occupation or employment; labor is the essential of agriculture. Nine-tenths of agriculture is labor. To say that a proposition regarding labor is not germane to the consideration of the subject of agriculture is certainly, in my judgment, entirely unfounded.

The provision that the gentleman suggests here by way of amendment is not to change the subject of investigation. It is not even to extend it. It is merely to particularize and to say that part of this useful information shall be that regarding labor on the farm. Can it be held that that is not germane to the proposition we have under consideration? I submit, Mr. Chairman, that is going very far afield for the purpose of defeating a very useful amendment.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia). The Chair has followed the discussion on this point of order with interest. It has been instructive and profitable. The Chair does not wish to be too technical in his rulings, and at the same time he desires to keep within the precedents, and also within the rule of reason. All parliamentary rulings ought to be founded in reason.

If the paragraph under consideration proposed to acquire and diffuse information connected with and relating to the farm, the amendment would be plainly in order, because labor is concerned with and immediately related to the farm. But that is not the purpose of the paragraph. The paragraph contemplates the acquisition and diffusion of useful information connected with the distribution and marketing of farm products. It goes no further.

The ascertainment of the whereabouts of an available labor supply is in no wise related to the collection and diffusion of information concerning the distribution and marketing of farm products. Very plainly, it seems to me, this amendment is not germane to the subject matter of the paragraph. Therefore it violates the rule relating to germaneness. The Chair sustains the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

For general administrative expenses in connection with the lines of investigation, experiment, and demonstration conducted in the Bureau of Markets, \$19,635.

In all, for general expenses, \$961,705.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, in order to call the attention of the committee to an item of publicity. Here is an appropriation that approaches a million dollars, a very large proportion of which goes to the collection of information and the distribution or diffusion of the same. So I take it that the diffusion of this information is one of the chief agencies, and it is to that feature that I want to call the attention of the committee.

Here in our system of Government we endeavor to take the public into our confidence and legislate very largely through public opinion, and in so doing the mails are literally flooded with material gathered from various sources and, I presume, sent broadcast, probably to a selected list. I do not know, but I am of the opinion that there is a good deal of it that is not of the value that would warrant its distribution. I am not inclined to criticize, but I hold in my hand, for example, the allotment that reached my office day before yesterday. It all came in one envelope. It comes touching the Bureau of Markets. I have not made a sufficient examination to know whether the information is collated and would be of real value. One sheet is a report of the meat conditions. Another relates to daily



wholesale price of fresh meats. Another sheet relates to live stock at stockyards, with special reference to the receipts. Another one is the same subject continued. Accompanying this list came inclosed three letters, each signed by the chief of the bureau, and each one calling attention to the specific information of the sheet accompanying. What I call your attention to is this, that the mails are literally flooded with this sort of information. I have this word from a publisher in Ohio:

We received this morning on one mail 14 letters, all with free "press dope" inside. And, as the publishing company gets its mail several times a day, owing to the nature of the business, some idea may be gained of the enormous amount of absolutely worthless stuff that is being sent out, for the same thing is being enacted in every newspaper office in the country.

He makes the statement that there is not a single newspaper in that section that prints any of this, and at the same time the mails are crowded, and the mail facility, in a sense, is quite seriously interrupted.

I have another letter from a different section of the State, in which the writer says:

I am not inclined to criticize, but I am inclosing for your inspection a portion of some mail received to-day, which will give you some idea of the demands made on the newspapers. Of course they should do what they can to help, and I believe they are willing to do so, but while they are performing this service they should be protected from imposition.

Now, I admit that when the Government sends out this matter it is no command that the newspapers are to print it. I presume it refers simply to information that the publishers can read and upon which they may write editorials. From that standpoint the information, if important, will serve a good purpose. But I now refer to an incident that I want the committee to know.

In my office last week appeared one of these innocent publicity agents who wanted me to give information touching whether my home was observing the rules and recommendations that have been published by Mr. Hoover on the conservation of food.

I am entirely in sympathy, I will say to the committee, with the campaign to conserve food. I was reared upon corn bread, and do not like it at all, but I will eat it, if necessary, so that the boys across the sea may have the wheat they otherwise would be denied. I am perfectly willing to do it, and am willing to make any other sort of necessary sacrifice. But I think that it is a woefully cheap performance for departments or Government agencies to send persons about in order to find some one in public office who would be willing to have his name appear in the papers to the effect that his family is observing this rule and that rule. This character of publicity provokes ridicule in the minds of the great masses. I have seen it in the Washington papers here, bringing in the families of the Cabinet officers and other various men and women high in station. These elaborated rehearsals of official Washington in its table observances have the virtue of furnishing copy I admit, but I am wondering what effect that sort of story is having upon the people throughout the country. In my judgment, it is not having a salutary effect, but rather creates a sense of disgust of an otherwise very creditable as well as important effort. I must confess that when the innocent individual came to me for what she claimed was interesting information, that she might write, as she had in other cases, a beautiful story, I was so outraged with the general itching for cheap publicity so apparent in many quarters that I did not treat her very courteously. I am not here making a public confession or apology, but I do think the Government ought not to undignify itself in such methods of publicity that are being conducted quite generally to-day. I am making the criticism as a friend of food conservation. At this particular time it would appear to me that the mails ought not to be flooded with so much of this—what would the newspaper boys call it?

SEVERAL MEMBERS. Bunk!

Mr. FESS. I would not want to use the word "bunk," but I do think this "canned stuff" should at this time give the mails relief and conserve the print paper, which has now come to be a real crisis.

The Clerk read as follows:

Enforcement of the United States grain standards act: To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to carry into effect the provisions of the United States grain standards act, including such rent and the employment of such persons and means as the Secretary of Agriculture may deem necessary, in the city of Washington and elsewhere, \$456,580.

Mr. STEENERSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. STEENERSON. Mr. Chairman, Congress on August 10 last passed the Food Administration law, under authority of which the prices of food and farm products are regulated. The act is broad enough to cover many other things. I notice in

the first section that it covers "foods, feeds, fuel, including fuel oil and natural gas, and fertilizer and fertilizer ingredients, tools, utensils, implements, machinery, and equipment required for the actual production of foods, feeds, and fuel."

Now that the products of the farm have been regulated in price, I wanted to know why this authority granted by this act was not extended to the other things, and I wrote to the Food Administration on January 15 about it, as follows:

JANUARY 15, 1918.

UNITED STATES FOOD ADMINISTRATION,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Please advise me what, if any, steps have been taken to control the price of "tools, utensils, implements, machinery, and equipment required for actual production of food, feeds, and fuel," embraced in the food-control act approved August 10, 1917.

Respectfully,

I received in reply this letter:

UNITED STATES FOOD ADMINISTRATION,  
Washington, D. C., January 18, 1918.

Hon. HALVOR STEENERSON,  
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I received your letter of January 15 asking for information in regard to the steps that had been taken for controlling the prices of tools, utensils, implements, machinery, and equipment required for actual production of food, feeds, and fuel.

This matter is under the control of and is being handled by the Department of Agriculture, who have entire charge thereof.

In the Executive order providing for the organization of the United States Food Administration, the only powers delegated to the United States Food Administrator are those with reference to foods, feeds, and their derivative products, the language of said Executive order being as follows:

"Said United States Food Administrator shall supervise, direct, and carry into effect the provisions of said act and the powers and authority therein given to the President so far as the same apply to foods, feeds, and their derivative products."

Since the power of the United States Food Administrator is limited to that delegated to him by the President, the Food Administration has never had any power to take steps for controlling the prices of tools, utensils, implements, machinery, and equipment.

Trusting that this satisfactorily answers your letter, I am,

Faithfully, yours,

HERBERT HOOVER.

Then I wrote to the Department of Agriculture, asking what they had done, and so far I have received no answer. But I want to point out that on December 4—that is, three or four months after this act was passed—the President made an address to Congress, in which he said:

"Recent experience has convinced me that the Congress must go further in authorizing the Government to set limits to prices. The law of supply and demand, I am sorry to say, has been replaced by the law of unrestrained selfishness. While we have eliminated profiteering in several branches of industry it still runs impudently rampant in others. The farmers, for example, complain with a great deal of justice that, while the regulation of food prices restricts their incomes, no restraints are placed upon the prices of most of the things they must themselves purchase; and similar inequities obtain on all sides."

The papers this morning contain a letter written by the President to the farmers, in which he repeats the statement that Congress should extend the authority. He says:

"The impression which prevails in some quarters that while the Government has sought to fix the prices of foodstuffs, it has not sought to fix other prices to determine the expenses of the farmer is a mistaken one."

Then he goes on to speak about other regulated prices. Then he says:

"I have every reason to believe that the Congress will extend the powers of the Government in this important, and even essential, matter so that the tendency to profiteering which is showing itself in too many quarters may be effectively checked."

It was no doubt an oversight on the part of the Chief Executive that he overlooked the fact that the authority to control the prices of the things that the farmer buys was in the law. I do not suppose that the President can remember all these things. He is charged with grave responsibilities, and no doubt it is impossible for any human being to remember all of these laws that we have passed giving him power. But he has many Cabinet officers and assistant Cabinet officers, many of whom are learned men, doctors of philosophy and scientists of note.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. STEENERSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota asks unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina asks unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota is recognized for five minutes more.

Mr. STEENERSON. I say he has Cabinet officers and assistants in each of these departments whose duty it is to aid him in executing and administering the laws of Congress and to remind him if he overlooks anything of importance. And it seems to me they ought not to let the President announce to the farmers of the United States that Congress has failed to act in this matter. We know that the executive department under the charge of the Attorney General several weeks ago agreed with the Harvester Trust to postpone the prosecution of that monopoly. That institution controls the principal tools and implements, the harvesters and mowers and reapers, and so forth, that the farmers have to buy and which have been increased in price to an enormous extent. That trust is now engaged in profiteering at the expense of the farmer, whose grain has been reduced in price under this food-control act, but their prosecution is postponed by the Department of Justice.

Some one ought to inform the Chief Executive that Congress is not lacking; that it passed this law on August 20, which confers, through the President's order, on the Department of Agriculture, as Mr. Hoover says, the power to regulate these prices of which the farmers most complain. It seems to me it would be a good idea to insert in this bill an appropriation for the employment and equipment of flappers, or climenoles. That term may be new to you, but our reliable friend, Gulliver, who visited an island floating in the air some years ago, told us that in that country the people were very scientific; they were addicted to the study of geometry and all the natural sciences, and, in fact, on all their ornamental robes they had pictures of the sun, moon, and stars, and that they were so absorbed in those scientific studies that it was sometimes necessary to remind them of their important duties close at hand; and therefore they had employed climenoles—that is, people who had fixed upon long poles blown bladders filled with dried peas or little pebbles—and when these dignitaries in high station forgot that there was some important duty to perform the climenoles just flapped them on the face and woke them up, so they would know what was going on. [Laughter.]

Now, would it not be a good idea to include in this bill an appropriation for about 16 climenoles, to furnish their own equipment, so that they could remind our executive officers that we had passed last year a law giving full authority to regulate the prices of farm implements and farm machinery and fertilizers, and that the Department of Agriculture now neglects to take any steps to enforce it? These climenoles, it seems to me, would be very desirable and useful. [Laughter.]

Gulliver's description of these people is as follows:

Their heads were all reclined either to the right or to the left; one of their eyes turned inward and the other directly up to the zenith. Their outward garments were adorned with the figures of suns, moons, and stars, interwoven with those of fiddles, flutes, harps, trumpets, guitars, harpsichords, and many more instruments of music unknown to us in Europe. I observed here and there many in the habit of servants, with a blown bladder fastened like a flail to the end of a short stick, which they carried in their hands. In each bladder was a small quantity of dried peas, or little pebbles (as I was afterwards informed). With these bladders they now and then flapped the mouths and ears of those who stood near them, of which practice I could not then conceive the meaning. It seems the minds of these people are so taken up with intense speculations that they neither can speak nor attend to the discourses of others without being aroused by some external action upon the organs of speech and hearing, for which reason those persons who are able to afford it always keep a flapper (the original is climenole) in their family as one of their domestics, nor ever walk abroad or make visits without him. And the business of this officer is, when two or three or more persons are in company, gently to strike with his bladder the mouth of him who is to speak, and the right ear of him or them to whom the speaker addresses himself. This flapper is likewise employed diligently to attend his master in his walks, and upon occasion to give him a soft flap on his eyes, because he is always so wrapped up in cogitation that he is in manifest danger of falling down every precipice and bouncing his head against every post, and in the streets of jostling others or being jostled himself into the kennel. (A Voyage to Laputa, ch. II.)

The Clerk read as follows:

Hereafter, in the performance of the duties required of the Bureau of Markets in the administration or enforcement of provisions of acts (United States cotton-futures act, 39 Stat. L., 476; United States grain-standards act, 39 Stat. L., 482; United States warehouse act, 39 Stat. L., 486; standard-container act, 39 Stat. L., 673; and the acts making annual appropriations for the Department of Agriculture) relating to the Department of Agriculture, the Secretary of Agriculture, or any representative authorized by him for the purpose, shall have power to administer oaths, examine witnesses, and call for the production of books and papers.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the paragraph. I should like to ask what is the need for inserting the new authority for representatives of the depart-

ment authorized by the Secretary of Agriculture to administer oaths, examine witnesses, and call for the production of books and papers? Under existing law, as I recall it, that authority is given only to the Secretary of Agriculture. If my memory serves me right, last year there was considerable discussion on the floor of the House as to whether this power should be extended to any person other than the Secretary of Agriculture. Am I right in that recollection?

Mr. LEVER. I think the gentleman is. I was just about to say that this whole matter was referred to a subcommittee. I see only one member of that subcommittee present, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ANDERSON], and I shall be very glad to yield to him to make a statement.

Mr. ANDERSON. May I say that as a member of the subcommittee I never saw this provision, and the only time I was consulted about it was over the telephone. I am not saying this in criticism of the chairman of the subcommittee, but simply to absolve myself from any responsibility for the provision, because I did not draw it, and never saw it until after it was in the bill.

Mr. LEVER. The language submitted in the Book of Estimates reads as follows:

Hereafter, in the performance of the duties required of the Department of Agriculture by the provisions of this act relating to the Bureau of Markets, the Secretary of Agriculture shall have power to administer oaths, examine witnesses, and call for the production of books and papers.

It was suggested in the committee that it might be wise to enumerate the acts which the committee had in mind, relating to the Bureau of Markets, and therefore the enumeration is made in the bill.

Mr. STAFFORD. My objection is largely to conferring this power on field representatives of the department to go in and compel the production of books and papers; in other words, the right of search. As I recall the argument on that question a year ago, this was severely contested by the leading lawyers of the House, especially the distinguished lawyer from Pennsylvania, Mr. GRAHAM. He thought it was too drastic a power to be vested in any field representative. To make the discussion brief, to curtail the argument, if the gentleman wishes to offer that as contained in last year's bill, simply striking out the words "or any representative authorized by him for the purpose," I shall not have anything further to say.

Mr. LEVER. I will be glad to accept the amendment, because the gentlemen who had charge of this are not present, and I am not well informed on it.

Mr. HAUGEN. I think what the gentleman has reference to is another provision that was in the bill a year ago, and that is modified considerably.

Mr. STAFFORD. No.

Mr. HAUGEN. This bill came out of conference in a modified form.

Mr. LEVER. Yes; that is true.

Mr. HAUGEN. It seems to me if we are to have anything, we ought to have what the bill provides.

Mr. STAFFORD. In last year's bill the phraseology was as follows:

Hereafter, in the performance of the duties required of the Department of Agriculture by the provisions of this act relating to the Bureau of Markets, the Secretary of Agriculture shall have power to administer oaths, examine witnesses, and call for the production of books and papers.

Mr. HAUGEN. If we are going to incorporate that language, we might as well strike out the whole thing, because that does not mean anything. To confer that power on the Secretary of Agriculture means nothing, because the Secretary of Agriculture is not going to administer oaths. He must delegate that power all along the line to those who are administering the law.

Mr. STAFFORD. That very subject was under consideration last year and it was severely contested on the floor here as to whether we should confer on field agents, mere inspectors, the authority to go into a person's private establishment and compel him to produce books and papers.

Mr. LEVER. Let me say to the gentleman that if he is going to insist on his point of order, probably the best thing to do under the circumstances would be to offer the language of the present act as an amendment.

Mr. STAFFORD. I have no objection to that.

Mr. LEVER. What does the gentleman from Iowa say as to that?

Mr. HAUGEN. If that is to be offered, we might just as well strike out the whole thing. Everybody knows the Secretary of Agriculture is not going to administer oaths to anybody. If that power is not to be delegated to those who administer the law, of course it will be of no effect.



Mr. LEVER. I appreciate what the gentleman says in that respect.

Mr. ANDERSON. May I interrupt right there?

Mr. LEVER. Yes.

Mr. ANDERSON. I think the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HAUGEN] is mistaken as to the effect of the provision. The solicitor held, as I recall, that the general authority to the Secretary of Agriculture was an authority to anybody in the department, and the purpose of the language—"or any representative authorized by him for the purpose"—was to limit the authority to persons who were specifically authorized by the Secretary of Agriculture to require the production of witnesses, their examination under oath, and so forth. In other words, the purpose of this provision was a limiting one rather than an extending one.

Mr. LEVER. I think it is not divulging committee secrets to say I believe that is what the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ANDERSON] had in mind when he suggested in the committee that this matter be looked into, and, as I say, a subcommittee was appointed to prepare a substitute for the language of the present law, and that committee reported this language to the full committee, and the committee included it.

Mr. ANDERSON. I had two objections to the proposition. One of them was this, that if this general power to administer oaths was to be given it ought to be given in respect only to administrative laws. By that I mean such acts as are enumerated here.

Mr. LEVER. Yes.

Mr. ANDERSON. And not to the provisions of the general appropriation bill. I am not willing to consent to this provision unless there is stricken out of it the language which makes it applicable to the general provisions of any appropriation bill, because no man under the sun can possibly keep track of this proposition if it is to apply to every single item in every appropriation bill. Clearly it ought to be confined to the administrative acts which the Department of Agriculture is authorized to administer, such as the cotton futures act, the grain grade standards act, and acts of that sort.

Mr. HAUGEN. The bill reported by the committee last year gave to the Secretary of Agriculture the power of seizure, and under it he might seize books and such things, a power which was seriously objected to by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GRAHAM]. The bill was amended in the Senate, and it came out of conference in the form of the present law.

Mr. LEVER. I think the gentleman is referring to that provision now.

Mr. HAUGEN. No; I am referring to this one provision.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, on the statement made by the gentleman from Minnesota and the gentleman from Iowa I think it is better to have the point of order made and submit either last year's phraseology, and permit the gentleman from Minnesota and the gentleman from Iowa, in collaboration with the chairman of the committee, to arrive at some revised form to meet the needs of the service. I make the point of order that it contains new legislation on an appropriation bill not authorized by law.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I concede the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia). The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Hereafter, in the performance of the duties required of the Department of Agriculture by the provisions of this act relating to the Bureau of Markets, the Secretary of Agriculture shall have power to administer oaths, examine witnesses, and call for the production of books and papers.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the amendment.

Mr. LEVER. That is the exact language of the existing law now.

Mr. ANDERSON. If it is existing law, in the ordinary sense in which that term is used, why reenact it here?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. In the act in which that provision occurs it is an emergency for the present war.

Mr. MONDELL. Is the amendment in the exact form of existing law without change or modification?

Mr. LEVER. It is.

Mr. MONDELL. Then why reenact it here?

Mr. LEVER. Does the gentleman object making it permanent law by the word "hereafter"?

Mr. MONDELL. I understood the gentleman to say that it was permanent law.

Mr. LEVER. I think it is. And I do not know that there is any necessity of carrying it in the bill at all.

Mr. MONDELL. Whatever the law is, we ought not to attempt at this time without due consideration to amend it.

Mr. LEVER. Well, Mr. Chairman, I will ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina asks unanimous consent to withdraw his amendment. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEENERSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota asks unanimous consent to revise and extend his remarks. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 81, in lieu of the paragraph ruled out, insert the following: "Hereafter, in the performance of the duties required of the Bureau of Markets in the administration or enforcement of provisions of acts (United States cotton-futures act, 39 Stat. L., p. 476; United States grain-standards act, 39 Stat. L., p. 482; United States warehouse act, 39 Stat. L., p. 486; standard container act, 39 Stat. L., p. 673) relating to the Department of Agriculture, the Secretary of Agriculture, or any representative authorized by him for the purpose, shall have power to administer oaths, examine witnesses, and call for the production of books and papers."

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the amendment. Do I understand the gentleman to say that under the general phraseology of existing law the Secretary of Agriculture has a right to depute the authority to administer oaths, examine witnesses, and call for the production of books and papers?

Mr. ANDERSON. The gentleman states it a little broader than is justified. The provision about which we have been talking was contained in the so-called food-survey act and applied only to the provisions of that act. It did not apply, as I remember it now, to the general appropriation acts for the Department of Agriculture. It was inserted as an emergency proposition under the food-survey act as a war proposition.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman kindly direct the attention of the committee to the provision in the food-survey act?

Mr. ANDERSON. I do not know that I can direct attention to the particular provision. I am giving my impression of it, and I may be entirely wrong.

Mr. STAFFORD. Why not allow this to remain as it is and, if necessary, it can be amended in the Senate.

Mr. ANDERSON. Very well; Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota asks unanimous consent to withdraw his amendment. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to carry into effect the provisions of the act of April 26, 1910, entitled "An act for preventing the manufacture, sale, or transportation of adulterated or misbranded Paris greens, lead arsenates, and other insecticides, and also fungicides, and for regulating traffic therein, and for other purposes," §94,490.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. This item just read, and the two preceding it, are very illuminating as illustrating the ways of bureaucracy. The Congress was persuaded in 1910 that it was of some importance that we should have legislation for preventing the manufacture, sale, and transportation of adulterated or the misbranding of Paris green and other insecticides, fungicides, and for regulating the traffic therein, and so forth. Probably it was important that there should be legislation on the subject, although it would seem that our general legislation to prohibit and prevent adulteration and misbranding ought to apply to these bug poisons.

But we legislated on the subject specifically, and they have built up in the Department of Agriculture quite a neat little division, which now spends, or we propose to give it the opportunity to expend, \$131,240. How on earth they can find ways to spend that much money for the purpose of preventing the manufacture, sale, and transportation of misbranded or adulterated bug powders I do not know. But if we are to divide the prohibitive statutes, the prohibitions by the Government up into sections, with a separate appropriation for each as we have done in this case, we would soon find the prevention of adulteration and misbranding would cost more than even this great war that we are engaged in.

One does not need to be fully informed as to what might be necessary for the purpose of carrying out this insecticide act to realize that \$120,000 could not be legitimately or properly or necessarily expended in a year for that purpose. If it can be, then there is no limit to the sum to which the expenditures of the Government may mount in the ordinary administration of

acts of prohibition and acts to prevent fraud. No department under the Government does better work than the Agricultural Department, and no department is more disposed to create new bureaus, new divisions, to reach out for new authority, to expend money in the domain of other departments, to duplicate work, and to extend its activities unnecessarily, than this same most worthy department.

That is a characteristic tendency of all good administrative departments, and there is where the duty of Congress and the committee comes in—to check the enthusiasm, to check the ambition, to check the desire of men who may be well intentioned to spend public money unnecessarily and uselessly.

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. Yes.

Mr. TILSON. Does the gentleman know just how they go about this? Do they send inspectors over the country inspecting establishments?

Mr. MONDELL. I have not any idea, but I have no doubt they have racked their brains to find the most expensive and indirect methods to carry out the provisions of the act. If that were not true, they could not have possibly built up a statutory roll of \$26,750 in Washington.

Mr. TILSON. I note they have only three inspectors, and the rest all seem to be clerks.

Mr. MONDELL. Quite likely clerks and clerks and more clerks.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wyoming has expired.

The Clerk read as follows:

Experiments and demonstrations in live-stock production in the cane-sugar and cotton districts of the United States: To enable the Secretary of Agriculture, in cooperation with the authorities of the States concerned, or with individuals, to make such investigations and demonstrations as may be necessary in connection with the development of live-stock production in the cane-sugar and cotton districts of the United States, including the erection of barns and other necessary buildings, and the employment of persons and means in the city of Washington and elsewhere, \$60,000.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. The use of money made under this appropriation and the paragraph on the preceding page, 84, for demonstrations on reclamation projects, justify the criticism I made some time ago and the limitation on the use to be made of money that was proposed by one of my amendments to a former paragraph. The testimony shows that in these projects, temporary and experimental in their nature, money has been expended for the construction of permanent buildings, ordinary structures at very large expense, houses costing three, four, and five thousand dollars; barns, to be used for experimental purposes, costing five and six and seven thousand dollars. Evidently it was not intended that such use was to be made of the money; but when an effort is made to limit or direct or forbid its use for purposes not intended by the act, not contemplated by Congress, certainly objection is made, and amendments directing the use of money and intended to prevent its use otherwise than as Congress expressly provides are defeated.

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Yes.

Mr. TOWNER. I am informed, and I would like to know whether the gentleman is able to give a confirmation of the statement, that there have been erected, under the authority granted here to cooperate with the authorities of States or of individuals, barns, sheds, and structures of that kind on the property of individuals who obtain the individual benefit, as a method or means of experimentation. Does the gentleman know whether that is true?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. I think as to expenditure of money under this particular item that is not true. In the State of Louisiana, where this work is largely done, land has been acquired by the Federal Government by gift or purchase for the temporary use of the Federal Government, and projects are in process there, and the money has been used for the erection of buildings on that land, and except as the land has been acquired temporarily or for temporary use in these experiments what the gentleman has said is not exactly true.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. Is this the item that originated because Congress placed sugar, that ultimately would go on the free list, and the plea was made by the Representatives of the State of Louisiana, by reason of such enactment, that the injury that would come to the cane-sugar producers of that State made it necessary to establish some experimental work to see whether cattle production and diverse industries could not be established in its place?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. The gentleman is entirely right about that. That was the origin of the item.

Mr. STAFFORD. Now that the need for it is past, the item still keeps running on.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Has the need of it passed? Mr. Chairman, the price of sugar is high on account of the war, but the need for relief of the people of this country from the effects of the Underwood tariff law will not cease as long as that law is on the books. It is true that this particular item was suggested and urged very strongly by Representatives and Senators from the State of Louisiana, who stated to us that the sugar industry had been destroyed as the result of the reduction of the tariff on sugar and the prospect of its entire removal, and insisted that it was absolutely necessary that something be done by way of teaching the people of that part of the country to engage in new lines of agriculture, and it was urged that a temporary station should be established in the sugar-cane section of the State for the purpose of experiments in the production of other crops and in the feeding and growing of live stock.

In that temporary experiment, however, they have gone further than was contemplated by the committee and, I am sure, by Congress by the erection of permanent buildings much more expensive than was necessary and in the purchase of a large number of animals. If it had been thought that the money was to be expended in that way, refusal or permission so to expend it would have been carried in the act. I have pointed out matters of similar character time and time again in the House, following the method I have used on the committee, and have urged incorporation in these acts limitations upon the activities of officials and agents of the department in the way of spending money, so as to make impossible the expenditure of money altogether contrary to the intention of Congress.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. TILSON. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman from Michigan has not explained just how this money is to be expended, I would like to have one minute in which to ask the gentleman from South Carolina to explain just how the money has been expended in times past.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I make the request six minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina asks unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments close in six minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan that he proceed for five minutes?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, it was the understanding that money should not be used for the purchase of animals, that the work should be done by way of advice and instruction to those who are engaged or wish to engage in the business, by experiments made with and upon animals, the property of residents of that section of the country, but no limitations having been put by Congress and an immense sum of money having been appropriated, they started upon a large project and purchased a large number of animals. There are hundreds of them on these projects now, and expensive buildings have been constructed for temporary use, but built as permanent structures. It all illustrates the need of this Congress imposing limitations upon the use of money. Just as I suggested a few moments ago by amendment on these experiments as to testing the tensile strength and use of waste of cotton, that no money should be appropriated in the erection of buildings, the leasing of property, the acquisition of real estate or expensive personal property to carry on these experiments, purely manufacturing, mercantile propositions and not marketing propositions, under the Bureau of Markets. The House did not agree with me and no limitations have been placed. I mention these two items—the reclamation project and the project in Louisiana designed to relieve the people of that section of the country from the natural effect of the Underwood tariff law—as glaring instances of the laxness of Congress while appropriating money, at the same time properly and definitely to restrict the use of the money.



Mr. ANDERSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. I will.

Mr. ANDERSON. I think the gentleman might well include the following item relating to experiments upon dry land, semiarid land, and of that appropriation last year \$19,000 was spent for the construction of buildings and \$7,000 additional is proposed to be used for the construction of buildings this year.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Yes; and if the committee will notice, it is under an item that calls for investigations and experiments, and permanent houses, costing \$2,000, \$3,000, and \$4,000, and, if my memory is right, the construction of barns costing, I think, as high as \$7,000 were erected.

To show the disposition further of these gentlemen to spend the public money, authority was given in the appropriation for the Bureau of Animal Industry to assist in the encouragement of the production of dairy animals and the dairy industry in sections that had been freed of the cattle tick, and it was expressly stated that the money should not be used for the purchase of breeding animals, believing that was expenditure they might make if not forbidden. The result was they did not buy animals for breeding purposes but they bought animals, using thousands and thousands of dollars, for every other conceivable purpose.

Mr. MONDELL. And then bred them?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. I do not know whether they bred them or took precautions they would not breed. I did not follow the work in that particular. They avoided and evaded the law, and precise limitations should be made upon these lump-sum appropriations.

Mr. LEVER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. I yield.

Mr. LEVER. I do not know I caught the gentleman's statement or not. Does the gentleman say the department has spent large sums of the cattle-tick appropriation for the purpose of buying stock; and if so, upon what authority does the gentleman make that statement?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. There is a subdivision in which it says \$50,000 may be used by the Bureau of Animal Industry for encouraging the production of live stock and making investigations and experiments and demonstrations by way of developing the dairy industries in the areas freed of the cattle tick, and money was at one time used, as I have stated, for the purchase of animals; but such use of money is not now made, because Congress changed the wording of the appropriation and expressly forbid such use; that is, forbid the purchase of animals for any purpose.

Mr. LEVER. I have never heard of it.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. And spent out of that money not money appropriated for exterminating cattle ticks, but money appropriated for encouraging dairying in tick-free areas. That kind of work is also conducted by the Bureau of Plant Industry through the county agents and others employed in extension work. Therefore there is duplication of work.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER] usually makes a fair and frank statement in regard to the items in his bill. I should like to have him, in this connection, state to the committee fairly and frankly just how the sum of \$60,000 or the \$40,000 in the next paragraph are spent. Are we conducting an experimental stock farm, and if so, what are we doing with the proceeds, if there are any proceeds?

Mr. LEVER. I will say very frankly to the gentleman that both of these items were inserted in the bill upon the floor of the House. Neither one of them was suggested by the Department of Agriculture, so far as I know, unless it was the live stock in the reclamation project in the West. At both of these stations, which are permanent stations, I will say to the gentleman, and they are likely to be there for all time or until the experiments have been concluded, that they are undertaking to deal with investigations. For instance, at the Louisiana station of the raising of mules, hogs, cattle, and dairy animals. They make investigations as to the utilization of native grasses and feeds and food, of sorghum, and various and sundry kinds of problems that enter into the live-stock industry. That is true also in a different way of the station on the reclamation project.

Mr. TILSON. A regular experimental station?

Mr. LEVER. It is nothing more nor less than a regular experimental station established for regional investigation.

Mr. TILSON. It was established, as I remember, for meeting a temporary emergency.

Mr. LEVER. The statement was made on the floor of the House, when this matter was under consideration, by the now

Senator from Louisiana that he thought it would be a temporary proposition.

Mr. TILSON. That was understood, I will state to the gentleman.

Mr. LEVER. The representative of the Department of Agriculture, before our committee, has never made a statement that the reclamation proposition is a temporary proposition. He has made the statement repeatedly that there are big problems to solve and this work will likely continue for many years until the problems can be thoroughly investigated.

Mr. TILSON. The necessary permanent buildings have been erected?

Mr. LEVER. Yes.

Mr. TILSON. And the expenditure of \$100,000 in these two items is apt to be continued indefinitely for the continuation of experiments?

Mr. LEVER. It is very likely to be made for an indefinite period for the conduct of these experiments, but, if the House wishes to do it, they can vote those propositions out and stop them.

Mr. TILSON. Then, in order to meet a temporary emergency, we have gone into permanent experimental work in a State where we were called upon to meet a particular emergency problem?

Mr. LEVER. I do not think that is quite a fair statement of the proposition.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEVER. I will.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. Can the climatic conditions that surround them in Louisiana, a semiarid district, be said to constitute a temporary condition? Are not those conditions constant?

Mr. TILSON. Was it not the intention to turn Louisiana, after the sugar industry had ceased to be profitable or ceased to exist by reason of the Underwood tariff bill, into a live-stock country, and was not this to be an experiment to try it out and see whether it would work or not?

Mr. LEVER. I will say to the gentleman frankly that I have never been deceived about this item, even if other Members have. I regard it as a permanent institution that will long remain after I am dead and gone. And that is true of the reclamation station.

Mr. TILSON. According to the present course of events, it seems that that is apt to be the result.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The Clerk read as follows:

Experiments in dairying and live-stock production in semiarid and irrigated districts of the western United States: To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to conduct investigations and experiments in problems connected with the establishment of dairying and meat-production enterprises on the semiarid and irrigated lands of the western United States, including the purchase of live stock, the erection of barns and other necessary buildings, and the employment of necessary persons and means in the city of Washington and elsewhere, \$40,000.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

I am very much interested in the statement made by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. McLAUGHLIN] in regard to the Louisiana item which was read, and which applies, of course, with equal or greater force to the item to which I have addressed my amendment. In this case a very large proportion of the appropriation has been used for permanent buildings, but, as the gentleman from South Carolina, the chairman of the committee, says, this item originated on the floor of the House. Members are responsible for it. The committee is, however, responsible for the regulation of the expenditures under all these items. I am inclined to think that the gentleman from Michigan is not entirely accurate in suggesting that there have been large expenditures made out of the appropriations for demonstrations on reclamation projects for buildings. I am not fully informed on the subject, but am under the impression that no considerable part of that appropriation has been so spent.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. I will say to the gentleman that I had in mind those experiments on the semiarid district, the one on the middle of page 85.

Mr. MONDELL. The item just read?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. The item just read.

Mr. MONDELL. A large proportion of that appropriation has been expended for permanent buildings. If any considerable portion of the reclamation item has been used for buildings, or for anything but temporary buildings, it has been misapplied, because, while that work is important and valuable, it is not necessary or wise to build expensive buildings. The Reclamation Service does some work along these lines, and the service does not spend any considerable amount of money for buildings. It erects such temporary buildings

as may be necessary, buildings costing at the outside a few hundred dollars apiece, and those are the only buildings that are necessary or justified in connection with any of these enterprises. It is true that if the committee starts out with the purpose and intent of establishing a permanent demonstration station permanent and more expensive buildings may be necessary. But that is not true with regard to the character of the work on the reclamation projects. It is valuable, useful, and helpful, but I hope it is not used to any considerable extent for building. I know the Reclamation Service does not use its funds in that way, and the Agricultural Department should not.

The Clerk read as follows:

That not to exceed \$63,000 of the lump-sum appropriations herein made for the Department of Agriculture shall be available for the purchase, maintenance, repair, and operation of motor-propelled and horse-drawn passenger-carrying vehicles necessary in the conduct of the field work of the Department of Agriculture outside the District of Columbia: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$13,000 of this amount shall be expended for the purchase of such vehicles, and that such vehicles shall be used only for official service outside the District of Columbia, but this shall not prevent the continued use for official service of motor trucks in the District of Columbia: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Agriculture shall, on the first day of each regular session of Congress, make a report to Congress showing the amount expended under the provisions of this paragraph during the preceding fiscal year.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the paragraph. What is the necessity for authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to purchase motor boats? I believe there is no such authority under existing law. We do authorize him to purchase automobiles for use on the forest reserves and in other activities of the department.

Mr. LEVER. The statement is made in reference to this item that there is no authority in the law to buy a motor boat. The Comptroller of the Treasury has decided that. So it requires specific authority to do so, and this is to give the authority, which is new. And the motor boats are used in connection with the Forestry Service, largely in Alaska. I think there are probably half a dozen or more of them.

Mr. STAFFORD. I would have no objection to giving the authority to the Secretary of Agriculture to purchase motor boats for use in Alaska, but I am not willing to allow them to purchase motor boats in the field service to be used for pleasure and to go around on joy rides at all seasons of the year.

Mr. LEVER. I certainly agree with the gentleman on that proposition.

Mr. STAFFORD. I can not see any necessity, perhaps, for having motor boats in Alaska, except in the southern waters. The streams up there are frozen most of the time. What is the necessity for them?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. There is no other means of transportation in certain parts of Alaska, except on the railroads in the interior. In many parts there is no way to go except by water.

Mr. STAFFORD. Are they small pleasure boats?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Yes; the boats are of small tonnage, driven by motors, and are the prevailing boats used there. They are called fish boats, largely, but they are a little better than fish boats; they are ocean-going boats of 15 or 20 tons.

Mr. STAFFORD. What has the gentleman to say about limiting the authorization for motor boats for use in Alaskan waters?

Mr. LEVER. I will say to the gentleman candidly that I think Alaska is the only place where they use these motor boats. It may be, however, that in some of the national forests they might have lake conditions, as we have in Alaska. I am not sure of that. I would hate to do that.

Mr. STAFFORD. We have some very desirable lakes in the national forests where it would be very nice to have a motor boat.

Mr. HAUGEN. If the gentleman will permit, I think a few are used in connection with the investigation of oysters and various things of that kind.

Mr. STAFFORD. In that connection the Secretary of Commerce has had authorized under an appropriation last year a large boat for that very purpose. There is no use in duplicating activities. That is a work for the Department of Commerce.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAFFORD. Yes; I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WALSH. Has not the gentleman from Washington [Mr. JOHNSON] had experience in transportation up in Alaska by means of motor boats, and does he not own one in that vicinity?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Yes; but I was very glad to get rid of it.

Mr. LEVER. If the gentleman from Wisconsin has an amendment he can offer it.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the reservation of the point of order if the gentleman will accept an amendment.

Mr. LEVER. We will accept it.

Mr. STAFFORD. No. I will not present the amendment at present.

The CHAIRMAN. The pro forma amendment is withdrawn. The Clerk read as follows:

Eradication of foot-and-mouth and other contagious diseases of animals. In case of an emergency arising out of the existence of foot-and-mouth disease, rinderpest, contagious pleuropneumonia, or other contagious or infectious disease of animals which, in the opinion of the Secretary of Agriculture, threatens the live-stock industry of the country, he may expend in the city of Washington or elsewhere, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$1,000,000, which sum is hereby appropriated, or so much thereof as he determines to be necessary in the arrest and eradication of any such disease, including the payment of claims growing out of past and future purchases and destruction, in cooperation with the States, of animals affected by or exposed to, or of materials contaminated by or exposed to, any such disease, wherever found and irrespective of ownership, under like or substantially similar circumstances, when such owner has complied with all lawful quarantine regulations: *Provided*, That the payment for animals hereafter purchased may be made on appraisement based on the meat, dairy, or breeding value, but in case of appraisement based on breeding value no appraisement of any animal shall exceed three times its meat or dairy value, and except in case of an extraordinary emergency, to be determined by the Secretary of Agriculture, the payment by the United States Government for any animal shall not exceed one-half of any such appraisements: *Provided further*, That so much of the appropriation of \$2,500,000 made by the Agricultural appropriation act of March 4, 1915, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916, for the arrest and eradication of foot-and-mouth disease, rinderpest, contagious pleuropneumonia, or other contagious or infectious disease of animals as remains unexpended at the close of the fiscal year 1918, is hereby reappropriated and made available for expenditure during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, for the objects mentioned in said appropriation act, including necessary investigations to determine whether said diseases have been completely eradicated in districts where they previously existed.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 87, line 15, after the word "contagious," strike out the comma.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KREIDER. Mr. Chairman, I rise for the purpose of asking the chairman of the committee whether the payment of one-half of the value of the cattle as appraised by the Federal Government is in any way contingent on the State paying to the owner of the cattle the other half, or whether the Government pays its half regardless of the State, where the cattle are located and condemned, paying anything?

Mr. LEVER. My understanding is that the Government pays its half regardless of what action the State takes, but the Government is always desirous of having the State pay the other half, and always tries to make such arrangements before going into a State. This matter has not been fresh in my mind for two or three years, because there has not been any outbreak of foot-and-mouth disease in the last three years. I am a little hazy in my recollection of it.

Mr. KREIDER. Well, I have no amendment prepared, but it occurs to me that for the protection of the owner of the cattle it would be a splendid idea to make the payment by the Federal Government conditioned upon the State paying also one-half.

Mr. LEVER. Here is the other end of that proposition: I think the gentleman will see it in a moment. This disease is so fearfully contagious and dangerous that I do not think the Federal Government could afford to cease its efforts to stamp it out simply because a State might be recalcitrant or belligerent or refuse to do its duty. If the foot-and-mouth disease should spread generally in this country it would practically wipe out the live-stock industry, so far as cattle is concerned; and while it would be desirable we can not afford to stand back on account of a State refusing to do its duty.

Mr. TILSON. Would it not result in the man not receiving anything at all?

Mr. LEVER. That might be the result.

Mr. KREIDER. I grant that that is possible, but I do not believe it would be probable. I think it would result in proper action being taken by the several States, providing that the owner of the cattle should be reimbursed for at least half by the State, and then the Government could pay the other half.

Mr. LEVER. I assure the gentleman that it would be a very desirable thing to do. Many of our appropriations are being made on that theory. But this is a matter of extreme exigency. When we are dealing with the foot-and-mouth disease it is like dealing with a house on fire. It must be dealt with promptly. We can not afford to take chances of a State not having the money or the legislature not being in session, or something of that kind, that would interfere with the work.



Mr. KREIDER. But is it not a fact that the actual taking of the cattle and slaughtering of them is under the police powers of the several States, and can only be done upon proper legislation by the State?

Mr. LEVER. Yes.

Mr. KREIDER. Now, if this appropriation and money available for this purpose were based upon a law of the State which would compel the State to pay the other half, it seems to me that the property owner, the cattle owner, the live-stock owner, would be reimbursed more nearly the value of the cattle which have been slaughtered than by this way, because his loss not only consists in the destruction of the cattle, but another contingent loss that is possibly as great as the loss of the cattle themselves, which the owner must bear.

Mr. LEVER. Let me say to the gentleman that, as he will recall, in the last outbreak of the foot-and-mouth disease we had a very serious difficulty with one State. Of course the Federal Government has the power which it can use and by indirection bring about a situation such as that which the gentleman has in mind. The Federal Government can quarantine any State against the spread of this disease and can keep the quarantine over that State until the State does adopt the methods and policies that the Government has outlined for all the States in the Union, and I think that is the way they have been getting at it in the past.

Mr. KREIDER. Is there any way in which we might perfect this bill so as to take care of that?

Mr. LEVER. This language, I will say to my friend, carried us through the greatest outbreak of foot-and-mouth disease that the country ever saw, and it has been very carefully worked out, and it would be dangerous to tamper with it.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words, in order to ask the chairman of the committee, along the line suggested by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KREIDER], upon what theory does the department proceed whereby it is willing to pay for the cattle which may be diseased under the foot-and-mouth disease item and not pay for property, such as a citrus tree, or a tree afflicted with white-pine blister rust?

I understand there is a prohibition that none of those appropriations shall be expended in payment for property destroyed in attempting to wipe out the citrus canker or the white-pine blister rust. Yet they are permitted to pay for an animal which is killed in an attempt to wipe out the foot-and-mouth disease. Will the gentleman state the reason for the distinction that has been made?

Mr. LEVER. I am not sure that this is a departmental theory at all. I am inclined to think it is more the theory of the committee which reported these items than it is of the department itself; and I am not sure that the committee has any definite theory about the matter except this: In my own mind I should think that on account of the great contagiousness and infectiousness of the foot-and-mouth disease, and the tremendous interests involved in it if it should spread over the country, it has been felt that the payment in part for the losses suffered is the best method of eradicating the disease. In other words, you get closer cooperation from the people, and you bring about a more certain eradication of the disease. For example, if a man has a very valuable animal that has foot-and-mouth disease, if he knows his loss has got to be a total loss, and if the animal is worth \$500 or \$1,000, or \$5,000, he may undertake to conceal the fact that this valuable animal has the disease in the hope that he may effect a cure; but if he knows that the Federal Government and the State government, acting together, will reimburse him for at least a part of his loss, that man is very likely to report the fact of the disease in his herd. I think that is the theory upon which we act.

Mr. WALSH. But upon the legal proposition, does not the gentleman think that the Government would have authority to kill the diseased animal without providing any compensation, the same as it has authority to destroy a tree without compensation?

Mr. LEVER. The Federal Government itself, except on its own property, of course, would not have authority to kill any of these animals. The Federal Government in fighting the foot-and-mouth disease has to act largely through the police powers of the State; but the principle is the same. Of course the State governments, I think, under their police powers, would have the right to kill these animals without making any compensation whatever; but the committee have gone on the theory that it is a wise policy, from the standpoint of stamping out the disease, to make some compensation.

Mr. WALSH. And the disease has been apparently stamped out.

Mr. LEVER. The disease has been absolutely stamped out.

Mr. FESS. The tree, being stationary, will not spread the disease so rapidly as the cattle which are shipped, and in that way, if not properly handled, will spread the disease so much more rapidly. Therefore the necessity of dealing with it immediately.

Mr. LEVER. Therefore the necessity of dealing with it immediately and vigorously.

Mr. WALSH. But from the standpoint of fair play, it does seem as though the man who has his property destroyed in the one case because of the danger of communicating disease should not be discriminated against in another case of destruction because of a similar danger, simply for the reason that his property is stationary and does not, perhaps, enter into interstate commerce.

Mr. FESS. I admit that from the standpoint of the individual there ought not to be a difference, but from the standpoint of public health there ought to be a vast difference.

Mr. LEVER. I think that is the view of the committee.

Mr. McFADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment, to ask the chairman of the committee a question. This bill appropriates \$1,000,000 to be expended in the city of Washington and elsewhere, and also provides for any balance from last year's appropriation. Can the gentleman tell us how much remains of last year's appropriation?

Mr. LEVER. Five hundred and eighty-one thousand two hundred and forty-eight dollars and twenty-eight cents.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. I move to strike out the last word, for the purpose of making a suggestion to the chairman of the committee. Line 20, page 86, authorizes the payment of claims growing out of past and future purchases and destruction of animals. Is it proper at this late day to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to pay old and stale claims? The Secretary of Agriculture considered a great many claims, and I think settled every one; but under this language he would be authorized to reach away back into the years of the past and pay claims that might be presented. It seems to me that this bill, which provides for the future alone, ought to appropriate only for the payment for future purchases and destruction of animals in case a new outbreak arises.

Mr. LEVER. Let me make this suggestion to the gentleman from Michigan: This matter was not taken up by the committee. This language has been well worked out. As I said a moment ago, it carried us through the worst outbreak of foot-and-mouth disease that we have had. Does not the gentleman think it would be inadvisable to attempt to amend this language on the floor without pretty full consideration?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. If there is any doubt as to the effect of the change, I would say yes.

Mr. LEVER. I will say very frankly that I do not know whether there are any outstanding claims. I assume that there are not.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. I do not think there are any outstanding claims.

Mr. LEVER. I do not think so, either.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. But this leaves the door wide open.

Mr. LEVER. I think we had better leave the language as it is.

Mr. HAUGEN. What would the gentleman say to striking out the words "past and future"? Then the bill would read—claims growing out of purchases and destruction.

Mr. LEVER. Does the gentleman think that in a matter as delicate as this we ought to try to amend it on the floor of the House?

Mr. HAUGEN. I do not think it is very important.

Mr. LEVER. I wish the gentleman would not press it. We had better leave it as it is. It has been passed upon.

Mr. ANDERSON. In the time of the gentleman from Michigan I wish to ask the gentleman from South Carolina if he can state how much of last year's appropriation was expended for the foot-and-mouth disease?

Mr. LEVER. My recollection of the testimony before the committee is that about \$17,000 was so expended.

Mr. ANDERSON. In looking over the report of the expenditures in the Department of Agriculture I found that something like \$600,000 was allotted for the foot-and-mouth disease, and I was wondering what the balance of that \$1,000,000 was allotted for and how it was spent—for these other contagious diseases?

Mr. LEVER. The clerk of the committee informs me that my recollection is correct. They spent \$17,000 out of the fund last year for the eradication of the foot-and-mouth disease, and I think the balance went back to the Treasury.

Mr. ANDERSON. In looking over the expenditures of the department I find that they made an allotment of \$600,000 and some odd for the foot-and-mouth disease. I do not know what the balance of the \$1,000,000 was allotted for. What I wanted

to ascertain was whether any part of the million dollars was expended for the outbreak of other diseases.

Mr. GOOD. How much has been expended, all told, for eradicating the foot-and-mouth disease in the last outbreak?

Mr. LEVER. I can not tell the gentleman, but it has been several million dollars—quite a considerable sum. I think the first appropriation was \$2,000,000, and since that we have been carrying a million dollars appropriation in the bill for several years, but not all of that has been expended.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEVER. Certainly.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. Can this money be used to eradicate tuberculosis?

Mr. LEVER. The appropriation in this item?

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. Yes; it says "or other contagious or infectious diseases of animals which, in the opinion of the Secretary of Agriculture, threatens the live-stock industry of the country."

Mr. LEVER. This appropriation is for an emergency arising out of the existence of the foot-and-mouth disease, rinderpest, contagious pleuropneumonia—yes; I think so. I presume it might be used for tuberculosis.

The Clerk read as follows:

To make surveys to determine the actual distribution of the pink bollworm in Mexico, and to exterminate local infestations in Mexico near the border of the United States, in cooperation with the Mexican Government or local Mexican authorities, \$25,000.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the paragraph. The bill appropriates all told \$500,000 for the elimination of the pink bollworm. As I recall, we appropriated \$250,000 in the last Congress—

Mr. LEVER. We appropriated \$300,000—\$250,000 in the deficiency act and \$50,000 in the Agricultural appropriation bill.

Mr. STAFFORD. How much of that \$300,000 has been expended up to the present time?

Mr. LEVER. About \$175,000; or, in other words, the amount appropriated will have been used by June 30 of this year.

Mr. STAFFORD. What is the condition of the pest at the present time so far as the United States is concerned?

Mr. LEVER. The pink bollworm made its appearance at three places in Texas—Hearne, Beaumont, and the Trinity Bay neighborhood. The outbreak at Hearne was not very serious, and I assume from the testimony before the committee that that has practically been taken care of. They had only one infection.

The situation at Beaumont is not so certain, because the worm was found in the cotton seed and some of the cotton seed has been sent throughout the country and has been planted this year. In the Trinity Bay section the situation is still considered serious. The State of Texas has passed a law creating a cotton free zone. I think of about 50 or 75 miles in width, in the hope of preventing the spread of the pink bollworm. Someone asks what a free cotton zone is. It is a zone in which no cotton is permitted to be grown.

Mr. STAFFORD. Were any hearings had before the committee as to this item? I have searched the various pamphlets furnished me but was unable to locate the hearing on this item.

Mr. LEVER. Yes; it is in the statement of Dr. Marlatt, of the Federal Horticultural Board.

Mr. STAFFORD. I have read some of the hearings in regard to the cotton boll weevil and it was stated that the cold weather had resulted in keeping down the spread of that pest. Has the cold weather had a similar effect on the pink bollworm?

Mr. LEVER. The pink bollworm, as I understand it, is not affected by climatic conditions as much as the cotton boll weevil is. Another thing brought to the attention of the committee was that the pink worm is a very, very much more serious menace to the cotton industry of the United States than the boll weevil ever had time to be. Now, this amount of money carried here, \$500,000, is to be used as set out in the bill. It was sent up to us in a lump sum and the committee, of its own initiative, segregated the items. The gentleman will notice that \$400,000 of the \$500,000 is really an insurance fund, which is on all fours with the item that we have passed for the foot-and-mouth disease. The other \$100,000 will be used as set out in the bill.

Mr. STAFFORD. What is the logic of the gentleman's position that the pest be controlled, as indicated by him, and \$125,000 available during the remainder of this year, already provided, and \$400,000 deficiency appropriation under the guise of an insurance fund that may be utilized? If this pest becomes a menace to the cotton industry of the South, why can not they come before Congress, as they did last year, and receive the large appropriation awarded them by the Committee on Appropriations?

Mr. LEVER. The department estimated \$800,000 for the work in a supplemental estimate sent in in the regular way. The committee considered the matter very carefully and I considered it very carefully myself. I concluded, and the committee agreed with me, that it should be reduced \$300,000, and this, at my suggestion, was done. We concluded that \$500,000 would be a sufficient fund to make us safe against the invasion of this worm. I felt this way about it: If we had had the foresight when the boll weevil was first introduced into this country to have taken vigorous, active measures against it, such as we are trying to do in this case, we might have saved the cotton situation. The fact about the matter is that the production of cotton has been decreasing year after year for the past four or five years. This past season's crop amounts to only about 11,000,000 bales, and that is not the world consumption of cotton; it is hardly two-thirds of the world consumption. Now, if we are to be invaded by another pest, which they say is worse than the boll weevil, I foresee that the cotton industry of this country is practically doomed.

Mr. STAFFORD. You change the language of the authorization from that carried in the prior acts so to permit the Department of Agriculture to go into Mexico and have surveys made either in collaboration or without collaboration of the Mexican Government and local authorities.

Mr. LEVER. Let me say to the gentleman on that point that I recognize what he has in mind. It is an unusual proposition and necessarily would require an explanation. The pink worm came into Mexico from Egypt about 1911. We discovered it in one or two Mexican localities in 1915 or 1916. It has been confined in Mexico to one or two small areas. The Laguna district is the largest area, and it affords a good situation for us to work upon, because the cotton planters of that district in a large measure are Americans and are large planters, willing to co-operate to the very limit. They have tendered to this Government 125 or 130 acres for experimental purposes. They are willing to clean up their seed and quarantine themselves, and do all that is necessary to try to wipe out this pest.

The other area in Mexico is nearer the Texas border, about 30 miles from Texas, and the infection is not so serious. Very little cotton is planted in that area. What we are trying to do is to make a drive on the seat of the trouble, which is the Laguna district in Mexico and the Trinity Bay district in Texas. If we can wipe the thing off the continent we are in pretty good shape to keep it out.

Mr. STAFFORD. Applying the logic of the gentleman's position, if we establish this as a precedent, we will be going into all countries of the world to stamp out such things as anthrax and all other pests that affect the commerce of this country.

Mr. LEVER. The answer to that is this. Here is a country, Mexico, which is torn by an internal war, which really has no very stable government. Revolution is sweeping back and forth over this very area.

Mr. STAFFORD. The same thing is true of Russia, as far as anthrax is concerned.

Mr. LEVER. Oh, I want to make my statement, for I am very earnest about this matter.

Mr. STAFFORD. So am I.

Mr. LEVER. Here is this country, a neighbor of Mexico, and here is a pest in Mexico within 30 miles of our border which absolutely threatens to destroy one of the greatest crops. Is it not wise for us to establish a precedent, which I hope we will be sensible enough not to follow except where absolutely necessary, under the most extraordinary circumstances—is it not wise for us, is it not good statesmanship for us to go down there and try to wipe out this thing, get at the seat of the trouble and completely eradicate it and relieve ourselves from the constant menace of this thing coming in from time to time?

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will permit, I believe it is more economical in the long run to undertake to stamp this thing out in Mexico than it is to continue to fight it along the border.

Mr. STAFFORD. Following the logic of the gentleman's position, it is more economical to go to the source of all these pests, abroad or otherwise.

Mr. GARNER. This Congress will be appropriating for an indefinite period from year to year in order to keep this from coming into this country. It is a part of economy, in my judgment, to use the largest amount of money you can toward stamping this out of Mexico, so as not to have to appropriate in the future from year to year to keep it out of this country. I investigated the thing pretty closely when they were about to close up one-half of my district.

Mr. STAFFORD. I realize that last year the gentleman was energetic, and properly so, in trying to secure the \$250,000 emergency appropriation. That has accomplished some good,



but that appropriation was limited in its effect to this country. If it has had its effect, why should we go to foreign realms and establish a precedent that may come back to plague us in the future?

Mr. GARNER. I just explained to the gentleman that in my judgment—of course it may not be very good—if we make this appropriation and make it available to fight this in Mexico, we will be able to save money in the future by keeping it out of this country from Mexico.

Mr. STAFFORD. If the gentleman will permit. Have not the present means been effective in suppressing, as far as it could, the pest in Texas?

Mr. GARNER. Indeed it has.

Mr. STAFFORD. What is the need of adopting new methods?

Mr. HEFLIN. Not yet.

Mr. GARNER. It is not entirely eliminated, of course.

Mr. HEFLIN. There are 5,000 acres now in Texas which has not been eradicated.

Mr. STAFFORD. That is because, maybe, of the limited time at disposal of the Government.

Mr. LEVER. If the gentleman from Wisconsin will permit—

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman allow me a suggestion?

Mr. LEVER. If the gentleman will let me handle this—

Mr. BLANTON. I would like to add this suggestion: Along the border in certain places, for instance—the Rio Grande River is an imaginary stream, by the way—these eggs can be carried across by the wind. You can not control it. It may be brought across by Mexicans or Americans or by the wind, or in other ways, and you have to get at the source of this in order to stop it.

Mr. STAFFORD. As I understand from the statement of the chairman of the committee, the two localities where this pest is present in Mexico are not near the border, where the winds from the south can not carry it across the Texas border?

Mr. BLANTON. But it is coming over the border all the time.

Mr. LEVER. One infected place in Mexico is within 30 miles of the border and the other, the Laguna district, is about 150 miles.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Not the Texas border?

Mr. LEVER. I will ask the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SLAYDEN] how far it is from the Texas border.

Mr. SLAYDEN. About 200 miles.

Mr. LEVER. I got the impression in my mind it was a farther distance. Now, I want to appeal to the gentleman from Wisconsin. This worm does not travel very far of its own accord, but may be transported hundreds of miles, largely on account of being in the seed or in the lint. It is being transported from the Laguna district into the Texas district. It is carried most largely in the seed of cotton, in railroad cars, automobiles, and things of that kind. It can go a couple of hundred miles a day in a passenger coach, for instance.

Mr. MONDELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEVER. I will.

Mr. MONDELL. Does the gentleman know how long this pink bollworm has been known in Mexico as an enemy to cotton; how long it has been operating there, and how extensively?

Mr. LEVER. My recollection is that it has been in Mexico since 1911, and it was discovered in the United States in 1916.

Mr. MONDELL. The gentleman does not know the origin of it as an enemy of cotton?

Mr. LEVER. It is an Egyptian pest; it came from Egypt.

Mr. STAFFORD. Why would it not meet conditions if this money should be continued in the phraseology of existing law—

Mr. LEVER. The gentleman means the sundry civil bill?

Mr. STAFFORD. We are going pretty far when we are going to consider local conditions in another country.

Mr. GARNER. Let me explain to the gentleman—

Mr. STAFFORD. Permit me to say this: If the pink bollworm was on the increase and the ravages were continuing, I think perhaps we might go to the experiment of going to a foreign country. Everything essential that is necessary I wish to do—

Mr. GARNER. I know that the gentleman does—

Mr. STAFFORD (continuing). In eradicating this pest, but I question whether we should go into a foreign country and disturb local conditions there to stamp out the pest there.

Mr. GARNER. Let me give you an illustration. These gentlemen who are undertaking to fight this pest probably know more about it, technically, than the gentleman from Wisconsin or myself.

Mr. STAFFORD. Naturally.

Mr. GARNER. Here is a border 600 or 700 miles long along this country in which cotton can be raised. There is not a

great deal of it raised on the Mexican side at this time. Now, let us suppose this pest does spread in Mexico and it gets up and down the river for 600 miles, the change in the tide of the river and the flow of it would bring the pest to this side.

Mr. STAFFORD. The gentleman is supposing a case that does not exist.

Mr. GARNER. It undoubtedly will exist if it continues in Mexico. If it does it will come along the river and we will have to fight continuously to get anything on this floor.

Mr. STAFFORD. When that condition confronts us we will meet it, but it is now two or three hundred miles away from the border.

Mr. GARNER. I am trying to impress on the gentleman that when the condition develops it will cost us two or three times as much as now.

Mr. GILLETT. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GILLETT. Will the Chair kindly state what is before the House? There has been an interlocutory conversation going on here for 30 minutes, which may be interesting to the gentlemen but not to the committee generally, and I make the point of order that the gentlemen are not in order.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I am not satisfied at the present time from the statement made that there is warrant for us going ahead to allow the Secretary of Agriculture to go into the business of revising and reforming conditions there.

A MEMBER. Mr. Chairman, the regular order.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order on the paragraph. It changes existing law.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, this item is fairly subject to a point of order, in my judgment, and I am not going to argue a position I can not sustain.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment in lieu of the paragraph stricken out.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

In lieu of the paragraph stricken out on the point of order insert the following:

"On account of the menace to cotton culture in the United States arising from the existence of the pink bollworm in Mexico, the Secretary of Agriculture, in order to prevent the establishment and spread of such worm in Texas and other parts of the United States, is authorized to make surveys and determine its actual distribution in Mexico; to establish, in cooperation with the States concerned, a zone or zones free from cotton culture on or near the border of any State or States adjacent to Mexico; and to cooperate with the Mexican Government or local Mexican authorities in the extermination of the local infestations near the border of the United States. For rent outside of the District of Columbia and for the employment of such persons in the city of Washington and elsewhere as the Secretary of Agriculture may deem necessary, \$500,000."

Mr. LEVER. That is identical with the language in the act.

Mr. STAFFORD. I understand the amendment is the same as in this bill?

Mr. LEVER. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. Under the phraseology I admit the department has the right to conduct surveys in Mexico.

Mr. LEVER. Yes.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. In carrying on any of its operations as to extermination in Mexico.

Mr. LEVER. I am inclined to think the department is exercising the power now to cooperate in exterminating this insect, under this language, in Mexico. I will be very frank with the committee.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. I will say that in many of these matters we have to rely on the Secretary. And if it is true even in a small part, as he tells us it is, it will be very well for us to stamp it out in Mexico right along the border. I hope the gentleman from Wisconsin will not object to the use of a little money in Mexico.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I desire to speak on the amendment.

Mr. LEVER. Will the gentleman from Wyoming excuse me just a moment? Mr. Chairman, I understand that the parliamentary situation is this, That all of the language of the bill relating to the pink bollworm went out on the point of order made by the gentleman from Wisconsin.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair, as soon as the gentleman from Wyoming had concluded, was going to ask the extent to which the gentleman from Wisconsin wanted his point of order to apply. The principle of it not only includes the language on page 88, but down as far as line 10 on page 89.

Mr. LEVER. I assume if any part of this item is sustained it will carry out the balance of the item.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would rule that way.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I believe the appropriation should be made. I think there is a condition warranting the

appropriation of a large sum of money to be used as necessary and when necessary, in view of a situation in which it seems altogether probable that we may be able to entirely stamp out an insect pest which is a very great menace to a very great industry. It is very clear that the item will in some form go in the bill. The money will be appropriated. It ought to be appropriated and used in the way in which the item was segregated by the Committee on Agriculture. That is the proper form, and in view of that fact I want to appeal to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] to withdraw his point of order and allow the item to go in as the committee segregated it and in the form in which it, the committee, wisely approved it. There is certainly nothing gained by striking out the language of the committee, drawn after careful consideration, and then making the same appropriation in a different form and in a form which does not give the department that free hand in the extermination of the pest which it ought to have in order to be effective.

If we are to attempt to stamp out this pest, let us go where it is, whether it be in Mexico or in the United States, and do the work. We might spend millions on our side of the line and never get anywhere, whereas the expenditure of a few thousand dollars on the Mexican side might accomplish all we seek to accomplish.

I hope the gentleman will withdraw his point of order.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, does the gentleman from Wisconsin intend to act on the suggestion of the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL]? If not, I move to strike out the last word. I want to get some information on this subject.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, if this appropriation became effective, as intended in the bill, there would be one, two, three, or four methods of expenditure. First, there would be an expenditure of \$50,000 to prevent the removal of cotton and cotton seed from Mexico into the United States.

Mr. LEVER. That is quarantine work.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I assume that money would go for the employment of men, would it not?

Mr. LEVER. It would go for disinfecting cars and seeing to it that there were no worms in the seed or in the lint.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. It would not be for material, but for the services of individuals?

Mr. LEVER. Entirely.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The next item, if the plan here is carried out, no matter how the Secretary gets the money, is for \$25,000 to make surveys to determine the actual distribution of the pink worm in Mexico. That means the employment of individuals, does it?

Mr. LEVER. Yes; the employment of individuals.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Twenty-five thousand dollars for that.

Mr. LEVER. We think the infection, or the pest, is confined to two districts in Mexico. It may be possible that he is somewhere else, but what we want to do is to get him on this continent.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I want to find out how the money is to be spent. The next item is for \$25,000 to investigate the pink worm in Mexico and elsewhere. That means the employment of more men?

Mr. LEVER. That means the employment of half a dozen experts to work in cooperation with the farmers in the Laguna district.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. That makes a total appropriation thus far of \$100,000. The next item is an important one. It provides \$400,000 to conduct surveys and inspections in Texas, or in any State where the pest may appear. Does that go wholly for the employment of individuals?

Mr. LEVER. It is very largely for the employment of individuals. The method they adopted in the Trinity Bay district was to go into a cotton field and pull up the cotton by the roots and cut it down and pile it up and pour kerosene on it and burn it up and absolutely get rid of it.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Will there be any instruction of farmers in connection with this? That might be what is called "survey work"?

Mr. LEVER. I think the Secretary would stretch his authority if he attempted to do that under this item.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The plan is for the expenditure, in all, of \$500,000 for the employment of individuals in various ways in Texas and Mexico?

Mr. LEVER. I will say to the gentleman that our hope is that practically the only expenditure that will be made will be a portion of the \$100,000 appropriation. We hope that it will not be necessary to encroach upon the \$400,000 fund, because we hope to keep this worm out of Texas.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I hope that will be done.

Mr. LEVER. And if so, we could not expend any more.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Texas is a very large State. We will concede that. But the expenditure of \$500,000 for this purpose means the employment—if you wanted to figure it out this way—of 100 men at \$5,000 per year, or 200 men at \$2,500 a year, or 250 men at \$2,000 a year, or 500 men at \$1,000 a year; or, if these men were employed merely for the purpose of pulling up cotton plants it would mean that if you paid \$500 per annum you could employ a thousand men for this work.

Mr. LEVER. The fact is you would not have to employ many men on a per annum salary. You would only employ these men when you found an infestation somewhere, and probably a large number of laborers in the community—farmers and farmers' boys, white and black—who could go into a field and pull up the cotton stalks and pile them up and pour kerosene on them and put a match to it. Of course, you would have to have some experts in the crowd.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. That is what I want to get at. I would like to know the number of experts and lecturers who may use up this \$500,000. If it is for common labor, such as the gentleman has described, I would not have much objection to it; but it seems to me we ought to stop employing so many of these "lecturers" at good salaries to tour the country.

Mr. LEVER. I agree with the gentleman fully on that. Let me say this: I believe I try to be frank with this committee—

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The gentleman always is.

Mr. LEVER. I take it that the very nature of this work would preclude the necessity of employing any very large number of experts, that the larger portion of this money, if it is used at all, would be used in payment of these day laborers in the community where the outbreak took place.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Does Texas offer to cooperate in any way?

Mr. LEVER. I will ask my colleague on the committee [Mr. Young of Texas] to answer that.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. It is apparently a Texas proposition, for the present.

Mr. LEVER. Let me answer that suggestion. I want to say, as pointed out so strongly by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Young] the other day, this cotton proposition is not a sectional proposition any more than the cattle proposition is a sectional one. For some reason or another—God in His providence knows more about that than we do—we are all dependent upon a certain number of States for the cotton production of this world, and especially for the cotton production of this country. Now, here is a worm which the entomologists tell us is the most destructive pest that has ever threatened the cotton industry. The query is, Are we going to fight that vigorously in the interest of all the Nation, or not? It is going to take money. I appreciate that. But if we had spent \$500,000 at the outbreak of the boll weevil in Texas and had adopted the drastic remedies that we are proposing here, both through the State of Texas—which is cooperating nicely—and the Federal Government, we probably would have saved the cotton situation in the South.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. This pink worm is of Egyptian origin, as I understand.

Mr. LEVER. Yes; it is found in Egypt, the Hawaiian Islands, the Philippine Islands, and, I think, in Brazil and in Mexico.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. There was a movement some years ago in the East to prevent the importation of certain Egyptian cotton, due to the prevalence of this pink worm in Egypt. We have an interest in this matter.

Mr. LEVER. That is right, and we carry an appropriation in this bill for that purpose; and they have a concern in Boston where they put cotton seed coming from Egypt under very high pressure to kill the worm.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. If this bill passes, will the Secretary of Agriculture have authority to prevent the invasion of this country at other points than Texas?

Mr. LEVER. Oh, yes; undoubtedly.

Mr. HEFLIN. If the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Moore] will permit me, I will state that this pink bollworm is in three cotton districts in Mexico. In one of the cotton districts in Mexico he reduced the cotton yield one-third in one year, and he has made it impossible to grow cotton in the Hawaiian Islands. He is the most dangerous pest that ever came into our country and I trust that the gentleman from Wis-



consin will withdraw his point of order and let this provision become a law as soon as possible. With this appropriation of \$500,000 we hope to prevent the spread of the pink bollworm in the cotton belt of the United States. Help us to destroy this terrible pest.

Mr. PAIGE. I move to strike out the last word. As a cotton manufacturer I want to say that I believe this is the best item in this Agricultural bill. I agree fully with the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL], and I trust that if it is not too late the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] will withdraw the point of order. [Applause.]

Mr. YOUNG of Texas. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] asked a question as to what Texas has done or contemplates doing with reference to the elimination of this pest that threatens the cotton industry of the country. Let me give just a little history. So far as Texas is concerned, we did not know there was such a pest until last year. This pest came across the border from Mexico—from the Laguna district and from the district just across from Del Rio. It was discovered in Texas during the crop-growing season of the past year. Prior to the discovery of this worm it was not unlawful for cotton seed to be shipped out of Mexico up into Texas or anywhere else in the cotton belt, for the purpose of crushing the seed. So last year some 12 or 14 cotton mills in Texas purchased cotton seed in Mexico and brought it over on the Texas side to be crushed by these oil mills. It was a legitimate business. It was discovered that in the shipments of seed this pink bollworm was being brought into Texas. Now, what happened? Some of this seed went to the mill at Beaumont, Tex.; some went to Houston, Tex.; and some went to Galveston, Tex. That is down near the border line of Mexico; but two shipments of that came to the northeast Texas, and 12 carloads came into my own town in northeast Texas to be pressed. Immediately upon the discovery of the fact that this seed was coming from infested districts quarantine regulations were made, and no seeds can be shipped out of Mexico into Texas or any other part of the United States now.

What did the Government do? The Government followed the history of the shipments of this seed. They went to the vicinity of each oil mill that purchased this seed and found out whether or not these oil-mill people had sold any of this seed for planting in their vicinity. In my own town, across the street where I live, my brother-in-law planted eight acres of cotton from these seeds. During the growing of the crop there would come a stranger, an agent of the Government, who would go through the patch examining stalk after stalk of the cotton. Nobody knew what his purpose was until late in the season, when it developed that he had found that the cotton-oil mill people in that town had sold this seed to my brother-in-law, who planted this patch. He was examining to see whether the insect reproduced itself in the crop. That is what was done all over Texas in the vicinity of these oil mills where the seed had been shipped.

What was the result as finally obtained? In the field in the vicinity of Hearne, where the seed had been pressed that had come out of Mexico, they discovered one infestation. That is below the central part of the State. There was one local infestation. The greatest infestation was around Beaumont and Trinity Bay section of the country between Beaumont and Galveston, where there was a general infestation.

But you must understand that that section of Texas is not the cotton-growing section of Texas. It has only little patches, little farms; whereas when you get to the central and northern part of the State the whole country is one great cotton plantation. So we did not find as big a problem to deal with in the lower section of Texas as we would have if it had struck the black-land section where you will find as much as a thousand acres in one field of cotton.

Now, when they discovered this infestation at Hearne they destroyed the field. The localities contributed and paid the man whose field was destroyed. The Government did not do it. The Government agents discovered the insect and labor was employed and the field destroyed. They are destroying the stalk, the matter on which they live, in the Trinity Bay section and the Beaumont section. That is the only way we know how to do it—destroy the cotton stalk on which the insect lives. The fly, from which the weevil comes—you gentlemen have all seen the little cannel fly, the pink weevil comes from a similar one—deposits the eggs on the little boll, and when the eggs hatch the insect goes into the boll and destroys it. They live on nothing but cotton.

Now, as to the destruction of the cotton, I am here to say that I know of one county in my district where the insect has not come but where the boll weevil has come. It attacks the square and the square falls and children have gone into these fields—merchants have put up notices offering prizes—children have

gone into these fields and collected these little squares by the multiple of thousands and have taken them in and got their reward. Then they burn these squares that contain the eggs of the insect that will destroy the crop.

Now, what has Texas done? The legislature was in session at the time this Hearne farm infestation was found.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for five minutes.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman permit me to make a statement?

Mr. YOUNG of Texas. Certainly.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, after conferring with gentlemen on the committee about the phraseology of the amendment as carried in the bill and considering the form of the pending amendment, as I was not so fully aware when I made the point of order of the phraseology of the authorization of last year, the only difference is that the department will be limited in going to Mexico to that district near the border, whereas under the paragraph in the bill they can go anywhere. I will say that my making the point of order was under some misunderstanding of the present law, and therefore I withdraw it. [Applause.] The gentleman from South Carolina can offer the phraseology that is contained in the bill as a substitute to the pending amendment and thus, I suppose, will accomplish what he had in mind.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] for that suggestion and for his fairness in this matter, and I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment which I offered, so that the original matter of the bill may be incorporated.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin withdraws his point of order, and the gentleman from South Carolina asks unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment which he has offered. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The gentleman from South Carolina now asks unanimous consent that the matter heretofore stricken out of the bill on a point of order may be considered and reinserted as a part of the bill. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The bill now stands as it was before the point of order was made.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, as the first paragraph alone was read, is it not advisable to read all of the paragraphs and have them all considered as one?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will order that that be done. The bill now stands as it was before the gentleman made his point of order.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I submitted a request that the gentleman from Texas might be allowed to proceed for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will put that request now. The gentleman from Massachusetts asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas may have an additional five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I suggest that it would be better, first, to read the items in the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the balance of the paragraph.

The Clerk read as follows:

To prevent the movement of cotton and cotton seed from Mexico into the United States, including the regulation of the entry into the United States of railway cars and other vehicles, and freight, express, baggage, or other materials from Mexico, and the inspection, cleaning, and disinfection thereof, \$50,000.

To make surveys to determine the actual distribution of the pink bollworm in Mexico and to exterminate local infestations in Mexico near the border of the United States, in cooperation with the Mexican Government or local Mexican authorities, \$25,000.

To investigate in Mexico or elsewhere the pink bollworm as a basis for control measures, \$25,000.

To conduct surveys and inspections in Texas or in any other State to detect any infestation and to conduct such control measures, including the establishment of cotton-free areas, in cooperation with the State of Texas or other States concerned, as may be necessary to stamp out such infestation, to establish in cooperation with the States concerned a zone or zones free from cotton culture on or near the border of any State or States adjacent to Mexico, and to cooperate with the Mexican Government or local Mexican authorities, or otherwise, by undertaking in Mexico such measures for the extermination of the pink bollworm of cotton as shall be determined to be practicable from surveys showing its distribution, \$400,000: *Provided*, That no part of the money herein appropriated shall be used to pay the cost or value of crops or other property injured or destroyed.

Mr. YOUNG of Texas. Mr. Chairman, the question was asked, What has Texas done? The legislature was in session when this discovery was made. We did not know how serious it was—nobody did. The legislature immediately appropriated \$10,000, but they did something better than the appropriation,



The legislature passed a law by which the matter could be handled, and but for the enactment of that statute we would have been without authority to handle it. That law provided a certain quarantine regulation, very drastic, and under that statute the governor of our State only a few days ago, exercising the authority given him by the statute, threw a quarantine district around every section of the infested part of the State, making it broad enough so that where this insect has been discovered no man can plant or grow one stalk of cotton this coming year, and by doing that, stamping it out in that way. Having no new cotton planted in that territory, there is nothing on which the insect can breed or thrive. By the exercise of this power we believe that this insect will be driven out of existence during the present year, and with this appropriation I believe that we can do what was done in Florida with the appropriation that you gave for the protection of the citrus-fruit industry. I believe that we can wipe out the insect in one year's time. Texas heretofore has grown from four to four and a half million bales of cotton to go forth and clothe the world, although this year only three million bales. With this appropriation, I feel that this industry will not be wiped out, and that that great State may still continue to give to civilization that which goes to bless humanity. [Applause.]

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I want to call the attention of the House to the following statement by D. R. Coad, United States Bureau of Entomology, Delta Laboratory, Tallulah, La. This statement gives a short history of this pink bollworm and demonstrates what a destructive pest it is, and, therefore, the necessity for the appropriation provided for in this bill. Here is the statement, and I hope the House will give it full consideration:

The cotton industry in the United States to-day faces one of the greatest menaces with which any agricultural industry has ever been threatened, a menace which threatens its very existence. This is the establishment within our cotton belt of the famous or, more properly, infamous pink bollworm of cotton. We have long been threatened with the introduction of this pest from Asiatic and African countries. Later it was discovered in the cotton fields of our immediate neighbor, Mexico. Now it has been found in the fields of our own cotton belt. Its establishment there and spread over this country must be prevented. My purpose here is to tell you something of what steps are being taken to accomplish this end and to describe something of the problem before the men intrusted with this important task. Before dealing with this phase of the question, however, I wish to outline briefly something of the characteristics and injury of this pest as well as its history in other countries.

The pink bollworm resembles the boll weevil in that it passes through several different forms in the course of its life cycle. However, instead of producing a weevil in the adult stage, as is the case with the old familiar enemy, a moth or "miller" is developed. This moth lays the eggs, which hatch and produce the larvae or grubs. These develop into a quiescent stage, called the pupa, and this in turn produces the moth, which starts the cycle off again. As is the case with the boll weevil, the pink bollworm accomplishes its damage in the larval or grub stage. The moth deposits the eggs on the cotton boll or square, and as soon as the young worms hatch they bore into the interior of the form, where they feed in much the same manner as the larva of the boll weevil. However, there is this important difference: The boll weevil prefers the squares and attacks the bolls only when necessary, while the pink bollworm reverses this order and, whenever possible, selects large, well-developed bolls for its attack. Incidentally the difficulties which would accompany cotton production in the presence of both these pests may readily be imagined, since one would specialize on the squares and the other on the bolls. Instead of being competitors, they would be allies in the battle against the farmer.

#### ATTACKS IMMATURE SEED.

The larval period during the summer lasts from 20 to 30 days, during which time it continues to travel through the cotton form, and when in the bolls it usually concentrates its attack on the immature seed. It then pupates, and the adult moth soon emerges. The normal life cycle or period from egg to egg is ordinarily from 35 to 50 days during the summer. Thus this pest may produce from four to six overlapping generations in the course of the season. The last brood in the fall, instead of producing adult moths, forms a cell inside the hull of the cotton seed, which it has hollowed out, or, in many cases, fastens two hulls together and remains in the cell between them. In this manner the worm passes the winter and is ready to produce a moth in the spring. However, it has been shown that in case of necessity the worm can remain alive in this cell for several years.

The actual injury of the pink bollworm to the cotton crop is in part precisely the same as that of the boll weevil. The feeding of the worms causes the bolls and squares to fall to the ground in many cases and frequently as much as 50 per cent of the crop of an infested field is lost in this manner. This by no means ends the injury, however, as wherever a single worm attacks a large boll and confines its attention to a single lock it forces the premature opening of the boll, thus greatly injuring the fiber of the uninfested locks. In addition, the inclusion of the infested locks in a bale produces a stained cotton, which is severely penalized in classing. The seed-feeding habit of the worm also causes great loss. The oil yield of the seed is reduced by several per cent and the germination is so seriously injured that it is frequently necessary to plant double the ordinary amount in order to secure a stand.

The methods of dissemination of this insect are, of course, of great importance. Flight, the method by which the boll weevil spreads from State to State, is of very slight importance, as the adult moth is a very weak flyer and has a decided tendency to stay under cover as much as possible. By far the most important method of spreading is in the seed. As I have already mentioned, the worms seal themselves up within the seed in the fall to spend the winter. These seed cells go through the gins uninjured and wherever these seed are transported the moths will emerge in the spring and seek cotton. Consequently

cotton seed or anything containing cotton seed moved from infested to noninfested territory is exceedingly likely to carry the infection. Some years back when the danger of importing this pest into this country was first considered a study was made of the baled cotton lint coming to our mills from Egypt. This cotton was roller ginned, and it was found that some seed passed around the ends of the rollers and others slipped through damaged rollers, so that the baled lint contained a considerable number of seed. These seed were found to frequently contain live pink bollworms. Calculations based on the examination of 37 bales showed that we were importing 16,000 live pink bollworms annually, and in the ordinary distribution of this cotton about 300 of these worms would go to the southern mills located within the zone of cotton cultivation. This very grave danger was eliminated by a system of quarantine, which I will discuss a little later.

#### IS WIDELY DISTRIBUTED.

This pest is now so widely distributed over the globe that it is difficult to determine its original home, but all indications are that it is a native of Africa. From there it has been distributed so that it is now present in all cotton-raising countries of Asia, including India, Japan, China, and others. In Africa it is found in all cotton-raising countries, including Egypt. It was introduced on the American Continent in both Brazil and Mexico. In many of these countries it is difficult to secure accurate estimates as to the damage, but all reports are unanimous in that the loss is very great. In Hawaii the pest forced the abandonment of cotton cultivation. In Egypt the minimum yearly loss is estimated at 10 per cent of the value of the crop, and the normal damage is much greater than this. In India the minimum annual loss is placed at more than \$10,000,000. Further information on the depredations of this pest being received from time to time indicate that there is hardly any limit except the cotton crop itself to the extent of its damage.

As exemplifying the manner in which this pest may be introduced and spread, I wish to describe the importation into Brazil and Mexico. With the very laudable view of improving the staple of their cotton, the Brazilian Government in 1913 and again in 1914 imported considerable quantities of planting seed from Egypt. These seed were distributed widely throughout Brazil, and it was found in 1915 that this had resulted in the establishment of pink bollworm in all cotton-growing regions of the country. It would be difficult to devise a more thorough and effective method of distribution for the pest. In 1916 these worms caused as high as 50 per cent loss in production at many points. The ultimate effect of this importation on the cotton industry in Brazil remains to be seen, but the best that can be hoped is a permanent decrease of the crop which may easily result in making cotton production unprofitable in that country.

#### FROM EGYPT TO MEXICO.

The introduction into Mexico was produced in much the same manner. In 1912 a supply of Egyptian seed was imported and planted near Monterey. This produced such a good crop that there was a great demand for the seed the following year, and they were planted throughout the entire Laguna district, which is the principal cotton-producing section of Mexico. Some time before this importation representatives of our Department of Agriculture had visited the Mexican cotton-growing sections and had found that Mexico at that time possessed no cotton pests which we did not have. In view of this and the fact that cotton cultivation in Mexico and in the United States is practically continuous at several points along the border the quarantine regulations against Mexican cotton were not nearly so stringent as those against other countries. In 1916 permits were requested for the importation of a large amount of Mexican seed. Owing to rebel activities, the Mexican oil mills had discontinued operations and the seed from three crops had accumulated. In order to realize on this stock of seed they were offered to Texas mills at very low prices. In all, 467 carloads of these seed from the interior of Mexico were admitted into this country, and these were distributed to 10 Texas mills distributed throughout the State. Shortly after this the pink bollworm was discovered in Mexico. Immediately all further importation of seed was stopped and all seed which had crossed the border was traced to the mills receiving them. Conditions at each mill were studied very carefully, with the view of determining the possibility of infestation of adjacent cotton, and it was deemed advisable to organize a force of scouts to watch the cotton surrounding these mills throughout the season. This work was undertaken by the Federal Horticultural Board, under the charge of Dr. W. W. Hunter, and has been continued by that office in cooperation with the Texas State agricultural departments throughout the subsequent developments. A force of inspectors was organized and all cotton which seemed in any danger of infestation was examined once a week throughout the season of 1917. All inspections were negative until on September 8, 1917, at which time a live pink bollworm was found in the field Hearne. Immediately a force of 25 entomologists were assembled at this point and all fields in the neighborhood were most thoroughly examined. Traces of the worm were found in four or five fields and the worm itself was found in two fields.

About 500 laborers were assembled immediately and these were put to the task of completely cleaning up all the cotton fields within the zone of infestation. For this purpose the plants were first cut down and then gathered and piled. The fields were then raked and, as a final measure, laborers were sent down every row on their hands and knees picking up every scrap of cotton plant remaining on the ground. All of this material was saturated with oil and burned. Seed cotton gathered from the fields was treated in a like manner and every effort was made to completely destroy everything which stood the slightest chance of harboring a pink bollworm. In all, 105 acres were treated in this manner at Hearne. The cotton and cotton seed which had been shipped from this district was traced up and its disposal was very carefully supervised.

#### BEAUMONT FINDS INFESTATION.

Following this, the examinations at other points were continued and in a very short time an infestation near Beaumont was reported. Investigation in that neighborhood showed that there were in reality two distinct infestations present. The Beaumont oil mill had received 184 cars of the Mexican seed and it was found that these were responsible for the infestation of a considerable number of the fields in that vicinity which were planted with seed secured from the Beaumont mill. In addition, however, a much larger infestation which was apparently of some years' standing was found southwest of Beaumont, extending practically around Trinity Bay. This infestation was traced as rapidly as possible and was soon found to include parts of five counties in the neighborhood of Galveston, Houston, and Beaumont. The infestation in the district around the Beaumont oil mill was found to be very light,



but the other infestation proved to be very heavy in spots. Considerable attention was devoted to tracing the origin of this second infestation, and it was finally determined to be very probably due to cotton blown ashore during the hurricane of 1915. At that time a considerable number of bales of cotton imported from the Laguna district of Mexico were on the docks at Galveston. These were blown off the docks and northward onto the shores of Trinity Bay. They were later salvaged from where they had been deposited by the tide and in order to get them out through the marshy ground the bales were broken open. Undoubtedly a considerable amount of cotton was left and the worms contained in this produced an infestation which persisted during 1916 without discovery.

A large force of both entomologists and laborers were assembled at Beaumont and started immediately on the task of cleaning up these infested fields as had been done at Hearne. Large forces of laborers were organized and furnished with complete camp outfits. Motor trucks were provided and the most thorough possible campaign of extermination was inaugurated. In all approximately 3,000 acres were found to be infested, and of this something over 2,300 acres has been cleaned up to date. Work is progressing on the remainder as rapidly as possible. All cotton originating in these fields is being traced and effective measures are being taken for its safe disposal.

#### EMBARGO AGAINST MEXICO.

Beginning in 1912 quarantine measures aiming at the prevention of the introduction of the pink boll worm into this country were instituted. At first these consisted of quarantines against the importation of seed from all countries except Mexico. Then the discovery of worms in Egyptian bales was made and the importation of these bales was prohibited. Experiments soon showed that by a new system of fumigation in a partial vacuum it was possible to kill the worms within the bales. Since that time large fumigating plants have been erected at the principal ports of entry and now all foreign lint entering this country is passed through the vacuum fumigation processes under Federal supervision. Following the discovery of the pink boll worm in Mexico the importation of Mexican cotton was absolutely prohibited. In addition, quarantines were promulgated providing for the inspection and fumigation of almost everything entering this country from Mexico except the natives themselves. All cars, regardless of their contents, are inspected, and since many of them contain old cotton seed from previous shipments they are carefully fumigated. The contents, whenever in the least suspicious, are treated in a like manner, and every step which can possibly be taken to prevent any chance of introduction is very carefully carried out.

On December 28, 1917, a Texas law became effective giving most drastic powers of quarantine. Among other things the governor is authorized to prohibit the planting of cotton at any point along the Texan border which appears subject to infestation from Mexico. In addition, this law provides for the prohibiting of cotton cultivation around any areas in Texas found to be infested with the boll worm. This power will be utilized and the districts around Hearne and Beaumont will be declared cotton free for the next three years. In this connection the Federal and State agents are doing all possible in advising and instructing the farmers in the use of substitute crops. In addition, all quarantines which I have mentioned will be strictly enforced and additional zones promulgated as may be necessary. The work of scouting at all suspected points will also be continued most vigorously.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to return to page 45 for the purpose of submitting an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington asks unanimous consent to return to page 45 for the purpose of submitting an amendment. Is there objection?

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, let it be read first for information.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment for information.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 45, add a new paragraph after line 11, as follows:

"That during the existing state of war the Secretary of War is authorized to make sales, without advertisement, at a fair valuation, to be determined by him, of national forest timber to be used, so far as suitable, for the construction of aeroplanes."

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I have eliminated from the amendment proposed a day or two ago all of the contentious matter, leaving the amendment to cover the actual necessities. I think I can convince the membership of the advisability of this by referring to a statement from the office of the Signal Officer of the United States Army, dated December 1, in which he calls upon the North Pacific country to furnish twice the amount of spruce for aeroplane stock that was being furnished at that time.

Mr. STAFFORD. I do not know whether there is any objection by anybody else, but there is no objection on my part.

Mr. NORTON. Reserving the right to object—

Mr. WINGO. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Certainly.

Mr. WINGO. As I gathered from the reading of the gentleman's amendment, there is no provision to take care of the question which the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORDNEY] raised yesterday.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I am afraid that can not be done at this time. If the gentleman will remember, the amendment as offered heretofore carried two new legislative provisions, one of which opened up a way through which the War Department could go into the forest reserve and take timber without charge, use part, and sell the remainder. The Navy Department has the right to take without charge forest-reserve

timber, the railroad engineering building in Alaska has that right, the Reclamation Service has that right, but the War Department has not. But, Mr. Chairman, I realize that I had too much new legislation in one item offered as a paragraph of an appropriation bill. So in eliminating the War Department free-gift provision I had, of course, to cut out the War Department sales provision. I have reduced the amendment to the first and immediate necessity. While the Army appropriation bill is being considered in committee I hope to see adopted a paragraph giving the War Department the right to forest-reserve products; also to permit the War Department to cut and sell timber on certain military reservations. My present amendment does only one thing; it provides that the advertising requirement be suspended, so that men can go into the forest reserves and bring out pieces of spruce.

Mr. WINGO. Does the gentleman's amendment authorize the Secretary of War to go ahead and sell the waste timber after the heart timber has been taken out of the tree for aeroplane stock?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. No; that phase is not now touched. The War Department will pay its price per thousand in the tree, and the Agricultural Department, through its Forestry Bureau, will receive that money. Whoever rives out the log will get the prices offered by the War Department for spruce pieces and the bonus as well.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, a point of order was reserved by the chairman of the committee on an amendment I offered on page 16, an amendment to the meat-inspection item. The proposed amendment increases the appropriation for meat inspection by \$100,000, that sum to be used for the inspection of horses and horse meat for export. I desire to ask the gentleman from South Carolina if he intends to insist upon the point of order?

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I took that matter up with the Secretary of Agriculture, and he informs me that he has had the matter up with Mr. Hoover, of the Food Administration, and that they have found there is no demand for horse meat in this country and little, if any, in foreign countries with which we are allied in this war. Personally, I think it is bad legislation psychologically for us to write in the bill any suggestion relative to horse meat, and I feel I must make the point of order, and I do make the point of order.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, this matter came up through the desire of certain horse growers in the West to find a market for their product, and the desire of others who have viewed with alarm the growing shortage in meats for export to utilize for export meats such as certain people of Europe have been accustomed to use. The State Department has had the question up with some of the European governments as to whether or not a certain amount of horse meat could be used in the countries of the allies where the people have been accustomed to the use of such meat. I am inclined to think that those negotiations have not come to a conclusion; that is my latest information. I think it is quite probable that our allies, some of them, may conclude that they can relieve the situation in regard to meat by the utilization of the meat of some of our horses not suitable for other purposes, but the item is clearly subject to the point of order, and therefore if the gentleman insists upon it the amendment goes out. I regret that he does insist on it, because I think that a condition may arise under which the State Department, even the Food Administration, may desire to have such meats inspected for export to the civilian populations of the territory of some of our allies who are unable to secure other meats. The gentleman seems to think that psychologically it is not wise. I yield to his psychological objection.

Mr. LEVER. I make the point of order, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. RUBEY. Mr. Chairman, a few days ago we had authority to return to an item on page 45, the paragraph beginning line 12 to 17, which went out on a point of order. At that time I offered an amendment, but at the time we had the item up for discussion the gentleman from Michigan offered an amendment, and I have embodied his amendment in my amendment and have made a slight change in the phraseology, and I offer the following substitute for the amendment which I offered and ask that I may have unanimous consent to modify my former amendment by offering this one.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

Mr. ANDERSON. That is subject to the reservation of the point of order?

The CHAIRMAN. Of course.

Mr. LEVER. I reserve the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. It was stated it was subject to the reservation of the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. RUBEY offers the following amendment, to be inserted on page 45, following the amendment just adopted: After line 11 insert the following:

"Whenever the Secretary of Agriculture shall find the expenses of travel can be reduced thereby, he may, in lieu of the actual traveling expenses, under such regulations as he may prescribe, authorize the payment of not exceeding 2 cents per mile for a motorcycle or 6 cents per mile for an automobile used for necessary travel on official business in the Forest Service: *Provided*, That there shall be no payment of mileage for use or travel of motorcycle or automobile furnished or owned or maintained by the Government of the United States."

Mr. ANDERSON. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. RUBEY. I will.

Mr. ANDERSON. Is it contended this language shall be permanent legislation now?

Mr. RUBEY. No. I left out the word "hereafter." It is not permanent legislation.

Mr. STAFFORD. If the gentleman will permit, the very language as submitted is permanent in form, and will be so considered, I believe.

Mr. RUBEY. It says "whenever the Secretary shall determine."

Mr. STAFFORD. That is enacting language for all time.

Mr. RUBEY. I do not think so.

Mr. STAFFORD. In my judgment it is.

Mr. ANDERSON. I have no objection to trying this proposition out for a year.

Mr. RUBEY. I would ask the gentleman from Wisconsin this question: Suppose, instead of the word "whenever," we should say "should the Secretary of Agriculture determine"?

Mr. STAFFORD. That is the same. That is continuing it for all time and not restricting it to this appropriation bill. Why not insert there "during the fiscal year 1919"?

Mr. RUBEY. I have no objection to that. I will, by unanimous consent, modify the amendment by inserting after the word "whenever" the words "during the fiscal year 1919."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent to modify his amendment as indicated. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The Clerk will report the amendment as modified.

The Clerk read as follows:

Modification of amendment: After the word "whenever," in the first line of the amendment, insert the words "during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment as modified.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment as a new paragraph, following line 9 on page 89.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 89, following line 9, insert the following as a new paragraph: "No part of any amount herein appropriated shall be used to pay salaries or for personal services in any department, bureau, or office in the District of Columbia which does not, subject to the provisions and exceptions of section 7 of the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation act, approved March 15, 1898, require eight hours of labor each day."

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to be recognized a moment. I ask unanimous consent that the debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto may close in five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina asks unanimous consent that the debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto shall terminate at the expiration of five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman. I suppose that the great majority of farmers in this country would be somewhat surprised to learn that the great Agricultural Department of the United States maintains a seven-hour working day. I think they would be rather surprised to find that to be so in time of peace, because I am confident the matter has never been called to their attention. And I think they would be more surprised than ever to find that that condition exists in time of war. I think they would be intensely surprised to find it at a time when they are urged to speed up the production of food products in this country, and when they realize, as they must realize, the shortage of labor. The farms are crying for labor. They are asked to put on high pressure in the production of food, and yet the Department of Agriculture in Washington is overmanned and underworked. Any department in Washington that can do its work in seven hours, with 137 days off of the yearly calendar that are not working days, is overmanned and underworked.

Now, the farmers of the United States, I undertake to say, are willing to do their full share. I have heard a great deal in this debate about the shortage of labor. No man realizes that more than the farmer. The farms are, as I said, crying for labor. The mines are crying for labor. The shops are crying for labor. The railroads are crying for labor. The manufacturing are crying for labor. There is a shortage of labor everywhere, and yet in the face of that fact most of the departments in Washington are working on a seven-hour day, with long vacations, numerous holidays, and numerous sick leaves. In the face of that they are bringing and attempting to bring to Washington thousands of new employees to work in the Navy Department and in the War Department and in some branches of the Treasury Department and State Department. They have already brought here between ten and twenty thousand new employees, and they have men now scouring the country to-day trying to bring additional employees to Washington.

If there is a shortage in the departments in Washington, if any department needs extra clerical help, there is one way to remedy it, and that is for the Department of Agriculture and the Interior Department and the Department of Labor and all these departments that are working on a seven-hour day to go on an honest basis of eight hours a day. [Applause.] When they do that and release the surplus number of clerks that they are now using and paying, whether they are using them or not, then those surplus clerks will be available for the department that needs them, and will be available without further exhausting the already overtaxed labor supply of the United States. [Applause.]

Why, we are asking men now to pay enormous taxes. What does that mean? It means an enormous production, for taxes can only be paid out of production. Productive toil is the only source that the Government can levy upon, and men must produce or they can not support the Government. They can not produce without labor, and the Government has no right to augment the labor shortage. It is an indefensible thing to think that the labor market is being affected and the shortage is being made more stringent by the bringing of thousands of young people here to Washington who ought to be engaged on the farm and in the productive toil of the country.

Now, the chairman of the committee may say, as the chairman of every committee has said, "Why tie this can on me? Why put this on my bill?" It is a duty on the part of every committee to put it on every bill, because unfortunately our bills are divided up among a number of committees. [Applause.] And I say the American taxpayer will not excuse any committee or any chairman of a committee for attempting to shove the thing aside, as regards his committee.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield? I will say to the gentleman that I propose to let this committee say—

Mr. BORLAND. I do not say that the gentleman has taken that position, but I want to forestall his taking that position.

Mr. LEVER. I have not any time. I have closed the debate.

Mr. BORLAND. The gentleman ought not, and will not. I think, take the position that the Committee on Agriculture, of all the committees of the House, ought to be unwilling to establish an eight-hour day in the Department of Agriculture.

Now, I just want to show what the business men in the United States think about this situation, and I will send to the Clerk's desk, to be read in my time, a letter I have received from a wholesale grocer of Kansas City.

The Clerk read as follows:

KANSAS CITY, Mo., June 29, 1917.

Hon. W. P. BORLAND,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BORLAND: You have favored an eight-hour day for employees of the United States Government at Washington, and you still favor it. You are right. We favor it. Fight it out on this line if it takes all summer, and if we can do anything to help the cause, let us know.

We have never heard of a serious argument why these employees of the Government should not work eight hours a day. If there is such an argument, we would like to read it. The last quibble which we saw was to the effect that a seven-hour day was best for the United States Government clerks because it gave them a chance to spend more money with the Washington shopkeepers.

If you know of any arguments in favor of a seven-hour day which serious-minded people can read with patience, let us have the literature.

Yours, truly,

RIDENOUR-BAKER GROCERY CO.  
J. C. LESTER, Vice President.

Mr. BORLAND. Gentlemen, I would be glad to have a vote on this proposition. [Applause and cries of "Vote!" "Vote!"]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BORLAND].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to call the attention of the gentleman from Missouri to the fact that the chairman of the committee did not oppose the amendment.



The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk resumed and completed the reading of the bill.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise and report the bill to the House with the amendments and with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the Agricultural appropriation bill (H. R. 9054) and had directed him to report the same to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment?

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a separate vote on the amendment on page 27, increasing the appropriation for the distribution of valuable seeds—the congressional seed-distribution item.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi: Page 27, line 24, strike out the figures "\$242,320" and insert in lieu thereof "\$363,480."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question being taken, on a division (demanded by Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi) there were—ayes 33, noes 60.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently there is no quorum. The Door-keeper will lock the doors. The Sergeant at Arms will notify absentees. Those in favor of the Candler amendment will, when their names are called, vote "aye," those opposed "no." The Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 121, nays 157, not voting 150, as follows:

## YEAS—121.

Almon	Draue	King	Rubey
Ashbrook	Eagle	Langley	Russell
Austin	Farr	Larsen	Sabath
Ayres	Ferris	Lazaro	Sanders, La.
Barkley	Fields	Lee, Ga.	Saunders, Va.
Beakes	Fisher	Leshner	Seais
Bell	Flood	Little	Sells
Blackmon	Gard	Littlepage	Shallenberger
Booher	Garland	McAndrews	Slisson
Brand	Garrett, Tenn.	McArthur	Smith, Idaho
Brumbaugh	Garrett, Tex.	McKeown	Snook
Burnett	Goodwin, Ark.	Mays	Stegall
Byrnes, S. C.	Gray, Ala.	Miller, Wash.	Taylor, Ark.
Caldwell	Greene, Mass.	Moon	Thomas
Candler, Miss.	Harrison, Va.	Morgan	Thompson
Cantrell	Hastings	Neely	Timberlake
Caraway	Hawley	Nicholls, S. C.	Venable
Carlin	Heaton	Nolan	Vinson
Carter, Okla.	Heflin	Oldfield	Walton
Clark, Fla.	Hensley	Oliver, Ala.	Watkins
Clark, Pa.	Hilliard	Oliver, N. Y.	Watson, Va.
Claypool	Hood	Overstreet	Weaver
Connally, Tex.	Huddleston	Park	Webb
Connelly, Kans.	Hull, Tenn.	Polk	Whaley
Cooper, W. Va.	Igoe	Powers	Wilson, Tex.
Crisp	Jacoway	Quin	Wingo
Dale, N. Y.	Johnson, Ky.	Rainey	Wright
Decker	Jones, Va.	Raker	Young, Tex.
Dickinson	Kehoe	Robinson	
Dies	Kiess, Pa.	Rodenberg	
Dominick	Kincheloe	Rouse	

## NAYS—157.

Anderson	Dowell	Hayden	Lundeen
Baer	Dunn	Hayes	Lunn
Beshlin	Dyer	Helm	McClintic
Black	Elliott	Hersey	McCormick
Bland	Elston	Hicks	McFadden
Blanton	Emerson	Humphreys	McLaughlin, Mich.
Borland	Esch	Husted	Madden
Buchanan	Fairfield	Ireland	Magee
Campbell, Kans.	Fess	James	Mansfield
Cannon	Fordney	Johnson, Wash.	Mapes
Cary	Foss	Jones, Tex.	Mason
Classon	Francis	Jrnl	Meeker
Coady	Freeman	Kearns	Merritt
Cooper, Ohio	Fuller, Ill.	Keating	Mondell
Cooper, Wis.	Gandy	Kelly, Pa.	Moore, Pa.
Cox	Garner	Kennedy, Iowa	Morin
Cramton	Glass	Kinkaid	Mott
Crosser	Glynz	Kitchin	Mudd
Currie, Mich.	Gordon	Knutson	Nelson
Dale, Vt.	Gould	Kravs	Nichols, Mich.
Dallinger	Graham, Ill.	Kreider	Norton
Darrow	Graham, Pa.	La Follette	Osborne
Dempsey	Green, Iowa	Lever	Paine
Denison	Greene, Vt.	Lathum	Parker, N. J.
Denton	Hadley	Lobeck	Parker, N. Y.
Dillon	Hamilton, Mich.	London	Phelan
Dixon	Hamilton, N. Y.	Loneran	Platt
Doolittle	Haugen		Purnell

Ramseyer	Scott, Iowa	Steenerson	Walsh
Randall	Scott, Mich.	Sterling, Ill.	Wason
Reed	Shackelford	Summers	Welling
Robbins	Sherley	Sweet	Welty
Roberts	Sherwood	Temple	Wheeler
Rogers	Sinnot	Tilson	Williams
Romjue	Sloan	Towner	Wood, Ind.
Rose	Smith, Mich.	Treadway	Woods, Iowa
Rucker	Smith, C. B.	Vestal	Young, N. Dak.
Sanders, Ind.	Snell	Voigt	
Sanford	Snyder	Volstead	
Schall	Stafford	Waldow	

## NOT VOTING—150.

Alexander	Ellsworth	Key, Ohio	Siegel
Anthony	Estopinal	LaGuardia	Sims
Aswell	Evans	Leibach	Slayden
Bacharach	Fairchild, E. L.	Lenroot	Slemp
Bankhead	Fairchild, G. W.	Longworth	Small
Barnhart	Flynn	Lufkin	Smith, T. F.
Bowers	Focht	McCulloch	Stedman
Britten	Foster	McKenzie	Steele
Brodbeck	Frear	McKinley	Stephens, Miss.
Browne	French	McLaughlin, Pa.	Stephens, Nebr.
Browning	Fuller, Mass.	McLemore	Sterling, Ia.
Burroughs	Gallagher	Maher	Stevenson
Butler	Gallivan	Mann	Stines
Byrns, Tenn.	Gillett	Martin	Strong
Campbell, Pa.	Godwin, N. C.	Miller, Minn.	Sullivan
Capstick	Good	Montague	Swift
Carew	Goodall	Moore, Ind.	Switzer
Carter, Mass.	Gray, N. J.	Olney	Tague
Chandler, N. Y.	Gregg	O'Shaunessy	Talbot
Chandler, Okla.	Griest	Overmyer	Taylor, Colo.
Church	Hamill	Padgett	Templeton
Collier	Hamlin	Peters	Tillman
Copley	Hardy	Porter	Tinkham
Costello	Harrison, Miss.	Pou	Van Dyke
Crago	Haskell	Pratt	Vare
Curry, Cal.	Helntz	Price	Walker
Davidson	Helvering	Ragsdale	Ward
Davis	Holland	Ramsey	Watson, Pa.
Dent	Hollingsworth	Rankin	White, Me.
Dewalt	Houston	Rayburn	White, Ohio
Dill	Howard	Reavis	Wilson, Ill.
Dooling	Hull, Iowa	Riordan	Wilson, La.
Doremus	Hutchinson	Rowe	Winslow
Doughton	Johnson, S. Dak.	Rowland	Wise
Drukker	Kahn	Sanders, N. Y.	Woodyard
Dupré	Kelley, Mich.	Scott, Pa.	Zihlman
Eagan	Kennedy, R. I.	Scully	
Edmonds	Kettner	Shouse	

So the amendment was rejected.

The following pairs were announced:

Until further notice:

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY with Mr. BURROUGHS.  
 Mr. PRICE with Mr. GEORGE W. FAIRCHILD.  
 Mr. SULLIVAN with Mr. BRITTEN.  
 Mr. SCULLY with Mr. HUTCHINSON.  
 Mr. BYRNS with Mr. BENJAMIN L. FAIRCHILD.  
 Mr. TALBOTT with Mr. BROWNING.  
 Mr. MARTIN with Mr. FREAR.  
 Mr. HOLLAND with Mr. GILLETT.  
 Mr. EAGAN with Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island.  
 Mr. ALEXANDER with Mr. CARTER of Massachusetts.  
 Mr. BARNHART with Mr. COPLEY.  
 Mr. STEELE with Mr. BUTLER.  
 Mr. BRODBECK with Mr. ANTHONY.  
 Mr. COLLIER with Mr. DAVIS.  
 Mr. ASWELL with Mr. CHANDLER of New York.  
 Mr. CAMPBELL of Pennsylvania with Mr. BACHARACH.  
 Mr. DILL with Mr. DAVIDSON.  
 Mr. CAREW with Mr. BROWNE.  
 Mr. BANKHEAD with Mr. CRAGO.  
 Mr. DENT with Mr. COSTELLO.  
 Mr. CHURCH with Mr. BOWERS.  
 Mr. DEWALT with Mr. CHANDLER of Oklahoma.  
 Mr. DOOLING with Mr. CURRY of California.  
 Mr. DOREMUS with Mr. GOOD.  
 Mr. HARDY with Mr. KELLEY of Michigan.  
 Mr. GALLIVAN with Mr. McCULLOCH.  
 Mr. HAMILL with Mr. McKENZIE.  
 Mr. KETTNER with Mr. EDMONDS.  
 Mr. ESTOPINAL with Mr. KAHN.  
 Mr. McLEMORE with Mr. MILLER of Minnesota.  
 Mr. GODWIN of North Carolina with Mr. LONGWORTH.  
 Mr. DOUGHTON with Mr. GRIEST.  
 Mr. KEY of Ohio with Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH.  
 Mr. FOSTER with Mr. ELLSWORTH.  
 Mr. HAMLIN with Mr. LUFKIN.  
 Mr. DUPRE with Mr. GOODALL.  
 Mr. HOUSTON with Mr. FOCHT.  
 Mr. GALLAGHER with Mr. HULL of Iowa.  
 Mr. HELVERING with Mr. SWIFT.  
 Mr. EVANS with Mr. HASKELL.  
 Mr. GREGG with Mr. FULLER of Massachusetts.  
 Mr. MAHER with Mr. LEHLBACH.  
 Mr. OLNEY with Mr. MOORES of Indiana.

Mr. FLYNN with Mr. GRAY of New Jersey.  
 Mr. MONTAGUE with Mr. PETERS.  
 Mr. HOWARD with Mr. MCKINLEY.  
 Mr. RAGSDALE with Mr. PORTER.  
 Mr. TAGUE with Mr. SANDERS of New York.  
 Mr. SMALL with Mr. TINKHAM.  
 Mr. OVERMYER with Mr. SIEGEL.  
 Mr. STEPHENS of Mississippi with Mr. PRATT.  
 Mr. RAYBURN with Mr. ROWE.  
 Mr. POU with Mr. SLEMP.  
 Mr. SIMS with Mr. STINESS.  
 Mr. SHOUSE with Mr. RAMSEY.  
 Mr. THOMAS F. SMITH with Mr. WHITE of Maine.  
 Mr. RIORDAN with Mr. STRONG.  
 Mr. STERLING of Pennsylvania with Mr. WATSON of Penn-  
 sylvania.  
 Mr. STEPHENS of Nebraska with Mr. ROWLAND.  
 Mr. SLAYDEN with Mr. WARD.  
 Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado with Mr. WILSON of Illinois.  
 Mr. STEDMAN with Mr. WINSLOW.  
 Mr. VAN DYKE with Mr. WOODYARD.  
 Mr. WHITE of Ohio with Mr. SWITZER.  
 Mr. TILLMAN with Mr. REAVIS.  
 Mr. WILSON of Louisiana with Mr. TEMPLETON.  
 Mr. WALKER with Mr. FRENCH.  
 Mr. WISE with Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Pennsylvania.  
 Mr. PADGETT with Mr. ZIEHLMAN.  
 The result of the vote was then announced as above re-  
 corded.

A quorum being present, the doors were opened.  
 Mr. LEVER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on  
 the bill and amendments to final passage.  
 The previous question was ordered.  
 The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any other  
 amendment? If not, the Chair will put them in gross.  
 There was no demand for a separate vote.  
 The other amendments were agreed to.  
 The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time,  
 and was read the third time.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I wish to  
 make a motion to recommit the bill with instructions.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman against the bill?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. I am not, but I am a  
 member of the committee.

The SPEAKER. If there is any gentleman opposed to the  
 bill who wishes to make a motion to recommit, the Chair will  
 recognize him. If not, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from  
 Michigan.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan moves to recommit the bill to the  
 Committee on Agriculture with instructions to report the same back  
 forthwith with an amendment as follows: On page 13, line 19, strike  
 out "\$250,000" and insert "\$500,000."

Mr. LEVER. I move the previous question on the motion to  
 recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. That is increasing the  
 tuberculosis item.

Mr. LEVER. I make the point that it is not debatable.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.  
 The question was taken.

Mr. LINTHICUM. I demand the yeas and nays.

Mr. MONDELL. I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 139, nays 142,  
 not voting 147, as follows:

#### YEAS—139.

Anderson	Dyer	Hamilton, N. Y.	McCormick
Austin	Elliott	Hawley	McFadden
Beakes	Elston	Hayes	McLaughlin, Mich.
Bland	Emerson	Hersey	Madden
Campbell, Kans.	Esch	Hicks	Magee
Cannon	Fairfield	Hull, Iowa	Mapes
Cary	Farr	Husted	Meeker
Chandler, Okla.	Fess	Ireland	Miller, Wash.
Clark, Pa.	Fields	James	Mondell
Classon	Fordney	Johnson, Wash.	Moore, Pa.
Cooper, Ohio	Foss	Juul	Morgan
Cooper, W. Va.	Francis	Kearns	Morin
Cooper, Wis.	Freeman	Kennedy, Iowa	Mott
Cramton	Fuller, Ill.	Kiess, Pa.	Mudd
Currie, Mich.	Gandy	Kinkaid	Nelson
Dale, Vt.	Garland	Knutson	Nichols, Mich.
Dallinger	Glynn	Kraus	Nolan
Darrow	Gould	La Follette	Norton
Dempsey	Graham, Ill.	Langley	Osborne
Denison	Graham, Pa.	Linthicum	Paige
Dillon	Greene, Mass.	Little	Parker, N. J.
Dowell	Greene, Vt.	Lobeck	Parker, N. Y.
Dunn	Hadley	Lundeen	Platt
Dupré	Hamilton, Mich.	McArthur	Powers

Purnell  
 Randall  
 Reed  
 Robbins  
 Roberts  
 Rodenberg  
 Rogers  
 Rose  
 Sanders, Ind.  
 Sanford  
 Schall

Scott, Iowa  
 Scott, Mich.  
 Sells  
 Shallenberger  
 Sinnott  
 Sloan  
 Smith, Idaho  
 Smith, Mich.  
 Snell  
 Snyder  
 Steenerson

Sterling, Ill.  
 Sweet  
 Temple  
 Thomas  
 Tilson  
 Timberlake  
 Towner  
 Treadway  
 Vestal  
 Voigt  
 Volstead

Waldow  
 Walsh  
 Wason  
 Wheeler  
 White, Me.  
 Williams  
 Wood, Ind.  
 Woods, Iowa  
 Woodyard  
 Young, N. Dak.

#### NAYS—142.

Almon  
 Ashbrook  
 Ayres  
 Baer  
 Barkley  
 Bell  
 Beshlin  
 Black  
 Blackmon  
 Blanton  
 Booher  
 Brand  
 Brumbaugh  
 Buchanan  
 Burnett  
 Byrnes, S. C.  
 Caldwell  
 Candler, Miss.  
 Cantrill  
 Caraway  
 Carlin  
 Carter, Okla.  
 Clark, Fla.  
 Coady  
 Collier  
 Connally, Tex.  
 Connelly, Kans.  
 Cox  
 Crisp  
 Cresser  
 Dale, N. Y.  
 Decker  
 Denton  
 Dickinson  
 Dies  
 Dixon

Dominick  
 Doolittle  
 Drane  
 Eagle  
 Ferris  
 Fisher  
 Flood  
 Gallivan  
 Gard  
 Garner  
 Garrett, Tenn.  
 Garrett, Tex.  
 Godwin, N. C.  
 Goodwin, Ark.  
 Gordon  
 Gray, Ala.  
 Harrison, Miss.  
 Harrison, Va.  
 Hastings  
 Haugen  
 Hayden  
 Hedlin  
 Helm  
 Hensley  
 Hilliard  
 Hood  
 Huddleston  
 Hull, Tenn.  
 Humphreys  
 Igou  
 Jacoway  
 Johnson, Ky.  
 Jones, Tex.  
 Jones, Va.  
 Keating  
 Kehoe

Kelly, Pa.  
 Kincheloe  
 King  
 Kitchen  
 Larsen  
 Lazaro  
 Lea, Cal.  
 Lee, Ga.  
 Leshner  
 Lever  
 Littlepage  
 London  
 Loneragan  
 Lunn  
 McAndrews  
 McClintic  
 McKeown  
 Mansfield  
 Meys  
 Moon  
 Neely  
 Nicholls, S. C.  
 Oldfield  
 Oliver, Ala.  
 Oliver, N. Y.  
 Overstreet  
 Park  
 Phelan  
 Polk  
 Quinn  
 Rainey  
 Raker  
 Ramseyer  
 Robinson  
 Romjue  
 Rouse

Rubey  
 Russell  
 Sabath  
 Sanders, La.  
 Saunders, Va.  
 Sears  
 Shackelford  
 Sherley  
 Sherwood  
 Sisson  
 Slemp  
 Smith, C. B.  
 Snook  
 Stafford  
 Steagall  
 Summers  
 Taylor, Ark.  
 Taylor, Colo.  
 Thompson  
 Venable  
 Vinson  
 Walton  
 Watkins  
 Watson, Va.  
 Weaver  
 Webb  
 Welling  
 Welty  
 Whaley  
 White, Ohio  
 Wilson, Tex.  
 Wingo  
 Wright  
 Young, Tex.

#### NOT VOTING—147.

Alexander  
 Anthony  
 Aswell  
 Bacharach  
 Bankhead  
 Barnhart  
 Borland  
 Bowers  
 Britten  
 Brodbeck  
 Browne  
 Browning  
 Burroughs  
 Butler  
 Byrnes, Tenn.  
 Campbell, Pa.  
 Capstick  
 Carew  
 Carter, Mass.  
 Chandler, N. Y.  
 Church  
 Claypool  
 Copley  
 Costello  
 Crago  
 Curry, Cal.  
 Davidson  
 Davis  
 Dent  
 Dewalt  
 Dill  
 Dooling  
 Doremus  
 Doughton  
 Drukker  
 Eagan  
 Edmonds

Ellsworth  
 Estopinal  
 Evans  
 Fairchild, B. L.  
 Fairchild, G. W.  
 Flynn  
 Focht  
 Foster  
 Frear  
 French  
 Fuller, Mass.  
 Gallagher  
 Gillett  
 Glass  
 Good  
 Goodall  
 Gray, N. J.  
 Green, Iowa  
 Gregg  
 Griest  
 Hamill  
 Hamlin  
 Hardy  
 Haskell  
 Heaton  
 Heintz  
 Helvering  
 Holland  
 Hollingsworth  
 Houston  
 Howard  
 Hutchinson  
 Johnson, S. Dak.  
 Kahn  
 Kelley, Mich.  
 Kennedy, R. I.  
 Kettner

Key, Ohio  
 Kreider  
 LaGuardia  
 Lehlbach  
 Lenroot  
 Longworth  
 Lufkin  
 McCulloch  
 McKenzie  
 McKinley  
 McLaughlin, Pa.  
 McLemore  
 Maher  
 Mann  
 Martin  
 Mason  
 Merritt  
 Miller, Minn.  
 Montague  
 Moores, Ind.  
 Olney  
 O'Shaunessy  
 Overmyer  
 Padgett  
 Peters  
 Porter  
 Pou  
 Pratt  
 Price  
 Ragdale  
 Ramsey  
 Rankin  
 Rayburn  
 Reavis  
 Riordan  
 Rowe  
 Rowland

Rucker  
 Sanders, N. Y.  
 Scott, Pa.  
 Scully  
 Shouse  
 Siegel  
 Sims  
 Slayden  
 Small  
 Smith, T. F.  
 Stedman  
 Steele  
 Stephens, Miss.  
 Stephens, Nebr.  
 Sterling, Pa.  
 Stevenson  
 Stiness  
 Strong  
 Sullivan  
 Swift  
 Switzer  
 Tague  
 Talbott  
 Templeton  
 Tillman  
 Tinkham  
 Van Dyke  
 Vane  
 Walker  
 Ward  
 Watson, Pa.  
 Wilson, Ill.  
 Wilson, La.  
 Winslow  
 Wise  
 Ziehlman

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following additional pairs:

On the vote:

Mr. HELVERING (against) with Mr. SWIFT (for).

Until further notice:

Mr. POU with Mr. DAVIS.

Mr. THOMAS F. SMITH with Mr. WILSON of Illinois.

Mr. VAN DYKE with Mr. SWITZER.

Mr. DEWALT with Mr. McCULLOCH.

Mr. GALLAGHER with Mr. LONGWORTH.

Mr. CLAYPOOL with Mr. GOODALL.

Mr. GLASS with Mr. VARE.

Mr. PADGETT with Mr. ZIEHLMAN.

Mr. RUCKER with Mr. HEATON.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question now is on the passage of  
 the bill.

The question was taken, and the bill was passed.



On motion of Mr. LEVER, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the engrossing clerk may correct the totals if there should be any correction.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from South Carolina asks that the engrossing clerk may correct the totals. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns to-day it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina asks unanimous consent that when the House adjourns to-day it adjourn to meet on next Monday. Is there objection. [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, Mr. BURROUGHS was granted leave of absence for the day, on account of illness.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, on what subject?

Mr. FERRIS. I want to print a short editorial on the war—peace and against war.

Mr. NORTON. And prosperity?

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts objects.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 36 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned to meet Monday, February 4, 1918, at 12 o'clock noon.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1. A letter from the president of the Georgetown Gas Light Co., transmitting detailed statement of the business of the Georgetown Gas Light Co., together with a list of stockholders for the year ending December 31, 1917 (H. Doc. No. 891); to the Committee on the District of Columbia and ordered to be printed.

2. A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting report regarding the transmission of postal matter to and from members of the American expeditionary forces in France (H. Doc. No. 892); to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads and ordered to be printed.

3. A letter from the president of the Washington Railway & Electric Co., transmitting report of the Georgetown & Tennytown Railway Co. for the year ending December 31, 1917 (H. Doc. No. 893); to the Committee on the District of Columbia and ordered to be printed.

4. A letter from the president of the Washington Railway & Electric Co., transmitting report of the Washington Interurban Railroad Co. for the year ending December 31, 1917 (H. Doc. No. 894); to the Committee on the District of Columbia and ordered to be printed.

5. A letter from the president of the Potomac Electric Power Co., transmitting report of the Potomac Electric Power Co. for the year ended December 31, 1917 (H. Doc. No. 895); to the Committee on the District of Columbia and ordered to be printed.

6. A letter from the president of the Washington Railway & Electric Co., transmitting report of the City & Suburban Railway of Washington for the year ended December 31, 1917 (H. Doc. No. 893); to the Committee on the District of Columbia and ordered to be printed.

7. A letter from the president of the Washington Railway & Electric Co., transmitting report of the Washington Railway & Electric Co. for the year ended December 31, 1917 (H. Doc. No. 897); to the Committee on the District of Columbia and ordered to be printed.

8. A letter from the president of the East Washington Heights Railway, transmitting annual report for the year ended December 31, 1917 (H. Doc. No. 898); to the Committee on the District of Columbia and ordered to be printed.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. SHOUSE, from the Committee on the Library, to which was referred the resolution (S. J. Res. 107) authorizing the erection on the public grounds in the city of Washington, D. C., of a memorial to Francis Asbury, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 280), which said resolution and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. GOULD, from the Committee on the Library, to which was referred the resolution (H. J. Res. 154) authorizing the erection of a memorial in Washington to the memory and in honor of the members of the various orders of sisters who gave their services as nurses on battle fields, in hospitals, and on floating hospitals during the Civil War, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 281), which said resolution and report were referred to the House Calendar.

#### PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 9455) to make valid certain certificates of naturalization; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. BORLAND: A bill (H. R. 9456) authorizing the Postmaster General to cancel or readjust the terms of star-route and screen-wagon contracts; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. GLASS: A bill (H. R. 9457) authorizing national banks to make contributions to the American National Red Cross; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 9458) to prevent and punish the sale of Army and Navy uniforms to persons not authorized to wear them; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARY: A bill (H. R. 9459) to increase the pensions of the widows of the War with Mexico; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9460) to regulate the hours of duty of the officers and members of the fire department of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9461) to pension widow and minor children of any officer or enlisted man who served in the War with Spain or Philippine Insurrection; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HICKS: A bill (H. R. 9462) to prescribe the personnel of the Navy Nurse Corps, the qualifications for appointment, and the method of appointment therein, the pay, allowances, and leave of absence of members of said corps, and the conditions under which they may be retired; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. FRANCIS: A bill (H. R. 9498) providing for the free transportation of officers and enlisted men of the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps of the United States, and of members of the Nurse Corps of the Army and Navy; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. AUSTIN: A bill (H. R. 9463) granting an increase of pension to James L. Henderson; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CALDWELL: A bill (H. R. 9464) granting a pension to Margaret Jackson; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9465) granting a pension to William F. W. Gordon; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9466) granting a pension to Louisa Donnelly; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9467) for the relief of Thomas Campbell; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CURRIE of Michigan: A bill (H. R. 9468) granting a pension to Ida M. Van Epps; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9469) granting a pension to Carrie L. Kibbe; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DENISON: A bill (H. R. 9470) granting an increase of pension to Charles Owens; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DOWELL: A bill (H. R. 9471) granting an increase of pension to Cyrus Riffe; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GRAY of Alabama: A bill (H. R. 9472) granting an increase of pension to James Powers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GREGG: A bill (H. R. 9473) for the relief of the legal representatives of Sarah J. Montgomery, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HAMILTON of New York: A bill (H. R. 9474) granting a pension to George H. Roberts; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HILLIARD: A bill (H. R. 9475) for the relief of Elizabeth T. Wells; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KEARNS: A bill (H. R. 9476) granting a pension to Chester A. Dryden; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KRAUS: A bill (H. R. 9477) granting an increase of pension to William Ducey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9478) granting a pension to Nancy Ault; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LANGLEY: A bill (H. R. 9479) granting an increase of pension to J. R. Evans; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McKINLEY: A bill (H. R. 9480) granting an increase of pension to George T. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9481) granting an increase of pension to Christian Marxmuller, alias Christopher Miller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MAPES: A bill (H. R. 9482) granting a pension to Mahalah A. Palmer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MILLER of Minnesota: A bill (H. R. 9483) granting a pension to Frank Bachmeyer; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9484) granting a pension to George A. Holmes; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9485) granting a pension to Carlos Forsman; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MUDD: A bill (H. R. 9486) granting a pension to E. P. Aler; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9487) for the relief of Charles C. Serrin; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RAINEY: A bill (H. R. 9488) granting a pension to Abigail Butts; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ROGERS: A bill (H. R. 9489) granting a pension to George F. Cook; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SHALLENBERGER: A bill (H. R. 9490) granting an increase of pension to R. H. Stewart; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9491) granting a pension to Marion Burnham; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STEENERSON: A bill (H. R. 9492) granting an increase of pension to Christian Gulbranson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WHEELER: A bill (H. R. 9493) granting an increase of pension to Edgar Parks; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WOOD of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 9494) granting a pension to Millie B. Cook; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9495) granting a pension to George F. Harter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9496) granting an increase of pension to Phoebe Miller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. OSBORNE: A bill (H. R. 9497) granting a pension to Sarah A. Dow; to the Committee on Pensions.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. DALE of New York: Petition of Association of Lithuanian Patriots of America, relative to independence for Lithuania; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FULLER of Illinois: Memorial of Union Label Trades Department of the American Federation of Labor, asking repeal of the second-class postage provisions of the war-revenue bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Prairie Club of Chicago, Ill., opposing the granting of grazing privileges in the national parks and of shooting in the bird reservations; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania: Memorial of tenth annual convention of the Union Label Trades Department of the American Federation of Labor, favoring elimination of section in war-revenue bill dealing with second-class postage; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of Tyrone Chamber of Commerce, protesting against periodical postage amendment; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of Asbury Chamber of Commerce, protesting against zone system for second-class mail; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. RAKER: Petition of Henry Adams, Veterans' Home, Cal., favoring volunteer officers' retired-list bill; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, memorial of National Council, Sons and Daughters of Liberty, favoring passage of House bill 4892, relative to immigration law; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of Columbia Post, No. 141, Department of California and Nevada, Grand Army of the Republic, favoring increase in pensions of ex-Union soldiers of the Civil War; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STEENERSON: Petition of citizens of Halstad, Minn., protesting against the proposed repeal of the second-class mail rates provision of the war-revenue act; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

#### SENATE.

MONDAY, February 4, 1918.

The Chaplain, Rev. Forrest J. Prettyman, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, we open the Senate this morning with a very great burden upon our hearts. We hear of our boys at the front receiving their first baptism of fire and blood. Our hearts go out to them. We present them to Thee, O God, asking Thy guidance and Thy blessing upon them. We pray that they may feel the support of a united country, and that they may have the courage which springs out of a consciousness of the pureness of their flag and the united support of a mighty Nation back of them. We pray Thee speedily to bring to them and their arms and to their flag the victory which comes to the unconquerable will of men who do right in Thy sight. For Christ's sake. Amen.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday last, when, on request of Mr. VARDAMAN and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

#### READING OF WASHINGTON'S FAREWELL ADDRESS.

The VICE PRESIDENT. In accordance with an order heretofore made by the Senate, that upon the 22d day of February in each year, or if that day should fall on Sunday then on the day following, immediately after the reading of the Journal, Washington's Farewell Address should be read to the Senate by a Senator designated for the purpose by the presiding officer, the Chair announces the appointment of the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GERRY] to read the address this year.

#### CRIPPLED SOLDIERS AND SAILORS (S. DOC. NO. 173).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of War, transmitting, in response to a resolution of January 31, 1917, certain information relative to the rehabilitation and vocational reeducation of crippled soldiers and sailors, which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed.

#### WASHINGTON GAS LIGHT CO. (H. DOC. NO. 891).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the annual report of the Washington Gas Light Co. for the year ended December 31, 1917, which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia and ordered to be printed.

#### WASHINGTON RAILWAY & ELECTRIC CO. (H. DOC. NO. 897).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the annual report of the Washington Railway & Electric Co. for the year ended December 31, 1917, which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia and ordered to be printed.

#### GEORGETOWN & TENNALLYTOWN RAILWAY CO. (H. DOC. NO. 893).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the annual report of the Georgetown & Tennallytown Railway Co. for the year ended December 31, 1917, which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia and ordered to be printed.

#### WASHINGTON INTERURBAN RAILROAD CO. (H. DOC. NO. 894).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the annual report of the Washington Interurban Railroad Co. for the year